THE
ACTS OF THE
APOSTLES

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS
AMEN HOUSE, E.C. 4
London Edinburgh Glasgow
Leipzig New York Toronto
Melbourne Capetown Bombay
Calcutta Madras Shanghai
HUMPHREY MILFORD
PUBLISHER TO THE
UNIVERSITY

Bible. N. T. Acts.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

A CRITICAL EDITION
WITH INTRODUCTION AND
NOTES ON SELECTED PASSAGES

BY

ALBERT C. CLARK
CORPUS PROFESSOR OF LATIN IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1933

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

DEDICATED

TO THE MEMORY OF

FRIEDRICH BLASS

PREFACE

THE Acts of the Apostles furnish the most interesting chapter in the story of what is generally called the 'Western text'. In the Introduction to this volume (§ 1), to which I refer the reader, I show that this term is a misnomer and conveys a *suggestio falsi*, when employed of a text which was current in the East, as well as in the West, in the second century A.D.: which formed the basis of the oldest versions, Syriac as well as Latin, and was used by the most ancient Fathers. These facts are allowed by the most thoroughgoing opponents of the text in question, even by Dr. Hort, and no one has stated them with greater candour than the latest editor, Prof. Ropes, as may be seen from the passage which I quote from him (p. xviii). I therefore venture to substitute the non-committal symbol *Z* for this question-begging term, and denote the agreement of the oldest Greek Uncials ℵ *ABC* by Γ (= *Graeci*).

I now proceed to say a few words about the special problem of Acts. This is that in Acts *Z* and Γ differ conspicuously in length. *Z* has a longer and Γ a shorter text. The passages which appear in *Z*, but are absent from Γ, are very numerous; some of them are of considerable length, e.g. xi. 2, xvi. 39, xxv. 24–5. The question therefore in Acts which dwarfs all others is whether this extra matter is genuine or not.

Various solutions of this problem have been suggested. I will not here repeat what I have said in the Introduction (pp. xx f.), but will state quite briefly that I agree with Ropes when he says that only two solutions are possible. Either *Z* is derived from Γ, or Γ from *Z*. He adopts the first alternative, I adopt the second. He considers that *Z* was developed from Γ by expansion, I consider that Γ is an abridgement of *Z*. I may remark that the solution adopted by Ropes is intrinsically less probable than that which he rejects, since it is easier to abridge than to invent fresh matter. A further objection is that patristic evidence for Γ is lacking before the time of Origen, while the existence of *Z* in the second century A.D. is proved by the evidence of the versions and the quotations of the early Fathers. It is an act of faith to suppose that Γ was prior to *Z*. The probability is that it was a revision, made not very long before the time when it begins to be quoted. These, however, are *a priori* arguments upon which I do not wish to insist. There is other evidence which is yielded by *codex Bezae* (*D*), the chief Greek authority for the *Z* text in the Gospels and Acts.

This famous MS. has a peculiar feature, viz. that it is written in lines of irregular length (not, as is usual, in lines of equal length). It is usual to speak of them as 'sense-lines', and this description fits fairly well the lines in Mt., Mk., and Acts, but it is inapplicable to those in Lk. and Jn. A description of these στίχοι, as they are generally termed, will be found in the special article upon *D* (pp. 178–81). It is agreed that this system of division did not begin with *D*, but was inherited from an ancestor or a series of ancestors. The analysis which I have made, both of the Greek side of the MS. (*D*) and of the Latin side (𝕷[d]), discloses a large number of corruptions, chiefly omissions of στίχοι, transpositions of στίχοι, and corruptions due to adjacent στίχοι (pp. 181–91), which testify to a number of intervening copies between *D* and a distant archetype. It is therefore quite possible that this peculiar method of line-division goes back to remote antiquity.

After this prelude I proceed to state my own view, viz. that in Acts (*not* in the Gospels) Γ represents the work of an abbreviator who, having before him a MS. written in στίχοι similar to those found in *D*, frequently (not, of course, always) adopted the rough and ready method of striking out lines in his model, botching from time to time to produce a construction.

This solution did not come to me at once. The relation of Γ to *Z* was first suggested to me by the observation that passages present in *D*, but absent from Γ, very frequently occupy a line or lines in *D*, and that in many cases Γ appears to have been botched in order to provide a construction after an omission. The evidence given by botching is of especial importance. Instances will be found on pp. xxv–vi. The only explanation which I could at first suggest was that Γ was formed from *Z* by a series of accidental omissions.

New light came from a palimpsest leaf which contains Cic. *ad Fam.* vi. 9. 1—10. 6 in an abridged form (pp. xxviii–ix). This palimpsest omits a number of passages found in the minuscule MSS., and is on occasions impudently botched by the abbreviator in order to disguise the omissions. As the method which he followed was not apparent, I happened to apply an arithmetical test, which I have often found very illuminating when dealing with omissions. The method of application and the results of this test will be found on p. xxix. A clue was furnished by the first passages which I examined, and it soon became obvious that the abbreviator had cut out lines of his copy, botching when necessary. In my work *The Descent of MSS.*, pp. 151–3, I have reconstituted the copy, showing the lines which were deleted and those which were retained. The same arithmetical unit is present in both.

The same test throws unexpected light upon a series of mysterious obels affixed in some MSS. to a number of passages in the speech of

Demosthenes against Meidias (pp. xxx–xxxi). The results in this case are even more startling, since the evidence is spread over a larger area. I cannot see any other solution except that the obels were first affixed by an ancient critic who wished to abridge the speech and obelized passages which generally coincided with lines in his text.

I pass by some examples of minor importance, and will state briefly that I stake my case in the first place upon the evidence provided by the palimpsest of Cic. *ad Fam.*

My work *The Descent of MSS.* appeared fourteen years ago and has been widely circulated. During this period no critic, so far as I know, has pointed out any flaw in these calculations. I venture therefore to hope that they are sound. If so, they show that some ancient abbreviators —I insert the word 'some' to prevent misapprehension or misrepresentation—when making an abridgement, sometimes resorted to the simple device of striking out lines in their text.

In view of this evidence I now ascribe the excisions in the Γ text of Acts to an abbreviator who very frequently struck out lines in his copy. The hypothesis of deliberate abbreviation clears up a number of difficulties which were left unexplained by the theory of accidental omission (p. xxxii).

The methods of the abbreviator are discussed on pp. xlv–lii. His most noticeable trait is his contempt for minute details. He was not interested in the 'seven steps' which led up to the prison at Jerusalem (xii. 10); the hours of the day during which Paul preached at Ephesus (xix. 9); the statement that the rioters at Ephesus 'ran out into the street' (xix. 28); the information that Paul when sailing from Samos to Miletus broke his journey at Trogylia (xx. 15), or that on his journey from Caesarea to Jerusalem he spent a night in a village on the way (xxi. 16); that the ship carrying Paul drifted 'for fifteen days' after leaving Cyprus (xxvii. 5), or that, after Paul's arrival in Rome, 'the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard' (A.V.) and that Paul was allowed to reside 'outside the camp' (xxviii. 16). His interest was in edification, not in topographical or chronological details. Hence his excisions are comparatively rare in the speeches and most common in the accounts of Paul's journeys. This dislike for detail caused him to substitute tame and colourless summaries for passages instinct with life and vigour, e.g. x. 25 (p. xxiii), xvi. 39, xxv. 24–5. A frequent result of his excisions is to produce obscurity. A typical example occurs in xv. 33 sq. (p. xlvii), where Γ omits *v.* 34, which explains how it was that Silas was still in Antioch (*v.* 40) after having previously received permission to go to Jerusalem (*v.* 33). Some writers consider this obscurity to be a laudable characteristic of Luke's style. Thus Ramsay remarks 'Luke expects much of

his readers'. I cannot look on obscurity as a merit, but regard it as a fault which betrays the hand of an abbreviator.

Sometimes the cuts change the sense. Thus in xviii. 27, according to *Z*, Paul is invited by Corinthians residing in Ephesus to go with them to Corinth: according to Γ, he went of his own will. In xix. 1, according to *Z*, Paul wishes of his own accord to go to Jerusalem, but is told by the Spirit to return to Ephesus; Γ merely states that he went to Ephesus, without any mention of his first plan or of the intervention of the Spirit. In xxiv. 8, according to *Z*, παρ' οὗ refers to Claudius Lysias; according to Γ, it refers to Paul. (For the absurdity of this reading cf. p. xlvii.) A more complicated case occurs in xv. 1 sq. (p. xlix).

Apart from these differences due to abridgement, there are irreconcilable variants. The most remarkable of these occurs in xx. 4, taken in conjunction with xix. 29. In xix. 29 Gaius and Aristarchus are both Macedonians: in xx. 4 Aristarchus is said to be a native of Thessalonica, but Gaius, according to Γ, is Δερβαῖος, i.e. a native of Derbe in Asia Minor. The *Z* reading is Δοβήριος, i.e. a native of Doberus (in Macedonia). For a full discussion of this striking passage, the importance of which has hitherto escaped the notice of scholars, I refer to pp. xlix–l and note *ad loc.*

There are also cases in which the reading of Γ is absurd. A striking example is in ch. xiii, where, according to Γ, a sorcerer is called Barjesus in *v.* 6, and this name is translated by Elymas in *v.* 8. Barjesus, however, can mean nothing but 'son of Jesus'. For a full discussion of this passage I refer to the notes.

It seems strange that so inferior a production as the abridged text should have been accepted by the Church. It must have suited the taste of the age in which it appeared and may have been made by someone who enjoyed a reputation in his own generation. It is not always the best text that gains immediate recognition. I venture to refer to a person of no particular importance, the African Father, Primasius. Two *editiones principes* of his works appeared in the same year (1544), one of which was printed at Paris and the other at Bâle. The Paris edition was taken from a corrupt and mutilated MS. which disguises long omissions by unskilful botching. The Bâle edition was founded on a good and fairly complete MS. It was, however, the Paris edition that was several times reproduced, while the Bâle edition found no successor.[1]

If the considerations which have been advanced are sound, it follows that the supremacy of what are frequently called the 'Great Uncials' (i.e. ℵ and *B*) can no longer be maintained. The chief duty of an editor

[1] *Descent of MSS.*, p. 104.

is to collect and combine the scattered evidence given by the various witnesses to the *Z* text. This was done in masterly fashion by Blass in his reconstitution of what he considers to be the 'Roman form' of Acts (= *Z*) as contrasted with a second edition by the same writer (= Γ). My own text is not indeed founded upon that of Blass, since I have considered all points independently and very frequently differ from him. It is, however, more like his text than that of any other editor, and I gladly acknowledge my great debt to him. On many occasions when my original view of a passage differed from that of Blass I finally became convinced that he was right. I cannot, however, accept his attribution of both *Z* and Γ to the same author (p. xxi).

In consequence of the light which they throw upon the development of the text, I have in this edition reproduced, with a few necessary modifications, the Bezan στίχοι, where *D* exists: where it fails, I use ordinary long lines. My chief object is to put before the eyes of the reader the extra matter furnished by *D* and its allies.[1] All such additions, apart from a few monosyllables, are printed in blacker type. When, in parts of Acts where *D* is extant, they are drawn from allies of *D*, without the support of *D*, the extra matter is enclosed in angular brackets. Where *D* is not extant, no such brackets are used. Where *D* omits passages found in Γ which are necessary to the sense, they are printed in ordinary type between two asterisks. Examples of these methods in close proximity to one another will be found in xviii. 2–3. The reader who takes the trouble to turn over the pages which contain those parts of Acts which are preserved in *D* cannot fail to notice the singular frequency with which passages omitted by Γ occupy στίχοι in *D*, and passages omitted by *D*, but present either in its allies or in Γ, come at the end of a στίχος. As I am chiefly concerned with differences between the longer and the shorter text, I do not use blacker type for *Z* variants which are purely verbal, i.e. which add nothing to the text. Thus, to take a striking case, in xviii. 17 the variant τότε ὁ Γαλλίων προσεποιεῖτο μὴ ἰδεῖν is printed in ordinary type, though it differs widely from the reading of Γ.

I fear that many readers will be inclined to skip what I have written upon 'Witnesses to the *Z* Text' (pp. 173–335). From my point of view these articles form the most important part of this volume, since they contain the evidence upon which conclusions stated in the Introduction and elsewhere are based. As the article upon *D* is somewhat unwieldy,

[1] Rendel Harris said in 1891 (*Texts and Studies*, ii, no. 1, p. 243) 'If the Western text could be edited in its primitive colometry, it would be an advantage from the standpoint of criticism and would assist us in distinguishing between interpolations and omissions'.

I have prefixed to it a table of contents (p. 173). Two subjects which I have discussed are of vital importance, viz. 'Graecisms in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$' and 'Vocabulary of $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$', and I hope that every critic, friendly or unfriendly, will glance at the evidence which I have collected under these heads (pp. 191–210). Suggestions about the provenance of *D* have been placed in the Introduction (pp. lv–lxiv), where they are more likely to attract attention than would be the case if they were buried in the special article on *D*.

In the articles upon '*Codex Thomae*' (pp. 226–33) and 'The Philoxenian Text' (pp. 305–29) I deal with very controversial subjects. I refer to *codex Thomae* (*c.Th.*) as the source of readings which Thomas of Harkel extracted from a Greek MS. that belonged to the Enaton monastery near Alexandria. These readings show that *c.Th.* was very closely connected with *D* and the recently discovered Michigan papyrus. Many writers have refused on *a priori* grounds to take the statement of Thomas in its plain sense, arguing that a Greek MS. similar to *D* was not likely to have been found in Egypt and that, if it had been, Thomas would not have described it as 'correct'. Some have even supposed that these readings came not from a Greek, but from a Syriac source (p. 327). The appearance of the Michigan papyrus has dealt a death-blow to these theories, and I think justifies the innovation which I have made in placing *c.Th.* among the Greek witnesses.

In this connexion it may be mentioned that since most of this volume was already in print a fragment of another papyrus containing a strongly marked *Z* text has come to light,[1] which Prof. Vitelli ascribes to the third century, a date which may require revision. It contains two passages (xxiii. 12–15, 24–29) where *D* is no longer extant, and in these its agreements are chiefly with *c.Th.*, the Fleury palimpsest ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$), and the Gigas ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$), the chief representatives of *Z* in the absence of *D*. Mgr. Mercati says that it comes from a papyrus similar to the Michigan papyrus.

Some readers may inquire why I have not included in the Apparatus variants from the standardized text which some call Antiochian and others Byzantine (in my opinion a more suitable term). So far as I can see, the later MSS. are derived from the old uncials, and their variants arise from ordinary causes, such as corruptions, interpolations, conjectures, and infiltration of *Z* readings. A number of MSS. which are 'Byzantine' in basis have incorporated so many of these readings that they have become important witnesses to the *Z* text. I have thought it sufficient to quote the readings of two such MSS., the most important of which is 616, and denote their consensus by the symbol δ. The use of the symbols Γ and δ has helped me to keep the Apparatus within reasonable limits.

[1] *Papyri greci e latini*, vol. x (1932) fasc. ii, pp. 112–18. See Addendum, pp. 409 ff.

I conclude with a brief reference to the impending publication of the Chester Beatty papyri, now in the hands of the British Museum experts. A preliminary notice by Sir Frederick Kenyon, which appeared in *The Times* of Nov. 19, 1931, states that in the Acts the text is eclectic in character, i.e. that it does not belong either to Γ or to *Z*. He says, however, that the leaves containing portions of Acts had not been fully collated at the time when the notice was written, and expresses himself in somewhat guarded language. *Ex Aegypto semper aliquid novi.* I am not a believer in the theory 'one country, one text'. On the contrary, I am disposed to think that very different texts were to be found in the same centre. Thus the Sinaiticus (א) and the Vaticanus (*B*) are generally supposed to have come from Egypt. The one MS., however, of the Gospels which is certainly Egyptian (*W*) differs widely from them. I have given reasons (pp. lv–lxiv) for supposing *D* to be an Egyptian MS., and have shown (pp. 254, 268, 304) that Greek MSS. similar to $\mathfrak{L}^h$ and $\mathfrak{L}^g$ circulated in Egypt and Syria. It will, therefore, not be surprising to me if the Chester Beatty papyrus contains a new type of text in Acts.

I have to express my grateful thanks to kind friends who have assisted me in the preparation of this work. Sir Herbert Thompson, Bart., whom I consulted on the subject of the Sahidic version and in particular the readings of the oldest MS. (p. xvii) at a time when Horner's text had not yet appeared, replied by sending me a full collation of this MS. together with select readings from other authorities. I can only re-echo the graceful language with which Prof. Ropes (p. xi) has acknowledged a similar obligation. I have also enjoyed the help of various Oxford scholars, especially the late Canon Brightman, Mr. S. Casson, the late Dr. F. C. Conybeare, Canon A. Ll. Davies, Mr. G. R. Driver, Prof. A. S. Hunt, Mr. H. M. Last, Mr. E. Lobel, Dr. E. A. Lowe, Mr. R. McKenzie, Canon Streeter, the late Prof. C. H. Turner, and Dr. H. J. White, Dean of Christ Church, whose names are so well known that I need not mention the subjects in which they are recognized experts.

A. C. C.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

§ 1. *The term 'Western text' a misnomer.*

THE text of the Acts has been the subject of so much discussion, especially of recent years, that I content myself with a brief statement of the problem. On the one hand we have the traditional text, based on the consensus of nearly all Greek MSS. Our oldest authorities for this, Vaticanus (*B*) and Sinaiticus (ℵ), are ascribed to cent. iv A.D. Next to them come the Alexandrinus (*A*) and the codex Ephraemi (*C*), ascribed to cent. v. We also have a large number of later MSS. which, though differing in minutiae, are in substantial agreement with the old uncials. For all practical purposes the Greek MSS. present a solid body of evidence.

On the other side we have one old uncial MS., the cod. Bezae (*D*), ascribed by recent scholars to cent. v. This MS. has some peculiar features. It is a bilingual (Greek and Latin) MS. written in lines of unequal length which more or less correspond to the sense. These 'sense-lines' are generally termed *στίχοι* by modern writers (cf. p. 178). Though *D* is inferior in age to ℵ*B*, it is admitted by those who are most hostile to its readings that its text goes back to extreme antiquity. Thus Scrivener says 'the text of codex Bezae, as it stands at present, is in the main identical with that which was current in the East and West as early as the second century'. Dr. Hort remarks that 'when every allowance has been made for possible individual license, the text of *D* presents a truer image of the form in which the Gospels and Acts were most widely read in the third and probably a great part of the second century than any other extant MS.' (*N.T.* ii. 149).

In the last few years a new witness has emerged in the shape of the Michigan papyrus published by Prof. Sanders.[1] This fragment, which contains Acts xviii. 27 to xix. 6 and xix. 12–16, appears to be not later than the early part of cent. iv.[2] It is therefore older than the oldest uncials (ℵ*B*). By good fortune it happens that the few sections preserved in the papyrus occur in a context where *D* has a number of peculiar readings, including extra matter absent from the other Greek MSS. Apart from some insignificant variants and some doubtful cases

[1] *Harvard Theol. Review*, xx, no. 1, Jan. 1927.

[2] Sanders ascribes it to cent. iii. Other experts assign it to cent. iv. To be on the safe side, I accept the dating of Schubart, who says that the earliest date which he can allow is the end of cent. iii, while he would prefer the beginning of cent. iv (*Bulletin of Bezan Club*, v, pp. 25–6, 1928).

the papyrus exhibits a text almost identical with that of *D*. We therefore now know that the *D* text existed in Egypt shortly after A.D. 300.[1]

Three centuries later (A.D. 616) Thomas of Harkel claims to have used in the Enaton, a monastery near Alexandria, a Greek MS. containing the Acts, from which he extracted a large number of variants. These readings, many of which are lengthy and of a striking character, agree closely with *D* and, where it exists, with the new papyrus. Many recent critics, arguing *a priori* that such a text cannot have existed in Egypt, which they regard as the special domain of the ℵ *B* type, have sought to discredit the statement of Thomas. The sensational appearance of the Michigan papyrus should cure them of this scepticism. I take the words of Thomas in their plain sense and place his MS., which I call *c.Th.*, among the Greek witnesses.

It is not only in the Acts that we find two rival texts. Similar phenomena occur in the Gospels, where we have the evidence of *D*, and in other parts of the N.T., where its place is taken by other MSS. In the Pauline Epistles the Greek MSS. are opposed by other Graeco-Latin bilinguals, one of which, known as D_2, is ascribed to cent. vi. The problem of the Acts is part of a larger question which concerns the N.T. as a whole, but assumes a special form in Acts, where we have a longer and a shorter text, the first being that of *D* and its allies, and the second that of the Greek MSS. in general.

The term 'Western' text is generally used to describe the recalcitrant tradition throughout the N.T. The term was invented in the infancy of N.T. criticism and was then employed in a geographical sense. It is now established that the supposed 'Western' text was found in the East as well as in the West, and circulated all over the Roman world. The epithet 'Western' is therefore at best a 'terminological inexactitude'. I shall return to this subject shortly.

The strength of the text to which this unfortunate name has been given lies in the support which it receives from the versions and patristic quotations previous to the time of Origen.

Augustine in a well-known passage tells us that in the earliest days of the Church individual Christians who had a knowledge of Greek made translations for private use.[2] It is acknowledged that a Latin New Testament was in use, at any rate in Africa, before A.D. 200.

The evidence furnished by the old-Latin versions is highly important, since they are founded upon Greek MSS. much older than any now extant.

[1] Cf. *J. T. S.*, xxix (1927), pp. 18–28.

[2] 'Ut enim cuique primis fidei temporibus in manum venit codex Graecus et aliquantum facultatis sibi utriusque linguae habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari' (*De doctrina Christiana*, ii. 11).

Particular interest is attached in Acts to the Fleury palimpsest (𝔏^{h}), which represents a version used by Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, in cent. iii. This MS. is one of the chief allies of *D*, and not infrequently preserves superior readings. Speaking generally, the old-Latin MSS., both in Evv. and Acts, agree with *D* against ℵ *B*, *cett.*

It is not so easy to fix the date when the N.T. was first translated into Syriac, but most authorities hold that this took place before A.D. 200. For the Gospels we have two old-Syriac MSS., known as the Cureton (𝔖^{c}) and the Sinaiticus (𝔖^{s}), of which it is sufficient to say that their tradition goes back to great antiquity. For the Acts no such old-Syriac text is now extant. That, however, such a version once existed is proved by the quotations of Ephrem, cent. iv. For the Acts we also have his Commentary, recently discovered by Dr. F. C. Conybeare, from whom I quote the following statement.[1] 'Ephrem used a primitive Syriac version of a Greek text almost identical with that of *D*. When his quotations vary from *D*, they never agree with the tradition of the Greek Uncials, but with the chief allies of *D*.' I avoid here controversial questions in connexion with later Syriac versions, the Peshitto and the Philoxenian version (A.D. 508), and content myself with a short statement. The Peshitto is mixed in character, but in Acts has a great number of very striking agreements with *D* and its allies. The Philoxenian version contains a large number of readings preceded by an asterisk, which in Acts nearly always agree with *D* or its allies, and form one of our most valuable sources of information.

The constant agreements of the Latin and Syriac renderings are quite surprising. It is normal to find Syriac support for any Latin variant and vice versa. In order to avoid the natural interpretation, which is that the old-Latin and old-Syriac are both derived from Greek MSS. of the same type, some disputants, *θέσιν διαφυλάττοντες*, maintain that the old-Syriac is derived from the old-Latin, while others argue that the old-Latin is derived from the old-Syriac. These antagonists may be left to confute each other.

The date of the oldest Egyptian version, the Sahidic, is less certain, but some recent authorities assign it also to the second century. Some Sahidic MSS. are of great antiquity. Sir Herbert Thompson has recently published a Sahidic text of St. John,[2] which is ascribed to A.D. *c.* 375. For the Acts the oldest authority is a British Museum MS. (*Or.* 7594) written *c.* 350.[3] The Sahidic version is undoubtedly mixed in character. Its agreements with *D* and its allies are more frequent in Acts than in Evv., and it is

[1] Ropes, pp. 377–8.

[2] *British School of Archaeology in Egypt*, xxix (1923).

[3] Budge, *Coptic Biblical Texts*, 1912.

a noticeable fact that these agreements are more frequent in the oldest MSS. than in those of later date. While the support of the Sahidic is only partial, it affords clear proof that MSS. similar to *D* and its allies existed in Egypt at the time when it was made.[1]

The patristic evidence for the early date and wide diffusion of the so-called 'Western' text is equally decisive. As I may myself be suspected of prejudice, I quote an adversary. Ropes says that the 'Western' text in both Evv. and Acts can be traced back to the first half of the second century. 'The first author to make large citations is Irenaeus, who had it in his hands about A.D. 185 and presumably was acquainted with it in Asia Minor before A.D. 150. In Evv. it was used by Marcion and Tatian about the middle of the second century. In Acts it appears to have been known to the author of the Epistle of Barnabas. It was used at the end of the second century by Tertullian, the oldest of African Fathers, and in the next century by Cyprian.' He also quotes passages from Irenaeus and Tertullian upon the trustworthiness of the text used by the Church, which imply that only one form of this was known to them. He is no less explicit in his account of its diffusion. Thus he tells us that 'it was in use at a very early period, not only in Gaul and N. Africa, but also in Syria and Egypt', and concludes by saying that 'in the second century, and not much less completely in a large part of the third, it swept the field, with the conspicuous exception of one locality, Alexandria' (p. ccxcii).

It is obvious that a geographical term like 'Western' should not be applied to a text which was used throughout the Roman world. Hort on occasions distinguishes between 'Western in a geographical sense and Western in a textual sense'. Thus when speaking of ℵ*B*, to which he gave the curious name 'Neutral MSS.', he 'surmises' that 'ℵ *B* were both written in the West, probably at Rome: that ancestors of *B* were wholly Western (in the geographical, not in the textual sense) up to a very early time indeed: and that the ancestors of ℵ were in great part Alexandrian in the geographical, not the textual sense' (ii. 267). I find this statement somewhat obscure, I might say confused, and likely to confuse the reader. As a rule he does not explain in what sense he uses the word, but employs it as a fatal epithet without comment.

Ropes is fully conscious that the term is a misnomer, and says that 'it is unfortunate that no better name should be at hand' (p. vii). It has

[1] Thompson, l. c., p. xxix *n.*, says that 'a reason for caution in fixing too early a date is that it is doubtful whether there was any rapid spread of Christianity in Egypt till the time of Demetrius, consecrated Archbishop in 188–9', referring to Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums* (1902). Cf. Horner, *Coptic Version*, iii. 398–9.

been proposed to use the term '*B*-text' and '*D*-text' to denote the two strains. To this he objects that 'the term Bezan-text, by which it was sought to avoid the fallacy or at least the *petitio principii* implied in the name "Western" text, has done more positive harm than the latter' (p. lxxx, *n.* 2). What the 'positive harm' is he does not specify. Possibly he is thinking of the numerous differences between *D* and its allies, and therefore objects to the use of '*D*-text' as a common term. It will be shown later on (p. xliii) that the tradition of the group is much more homogeneous than has been supposed. On the other hand he habitually employs the term '*B*-text' for the readings of the Greek uncials in general, though he admits that 'where *B* stands alone or with very weak support, it seems to be more often wrong than right' (p. ccc). He himself adopts the expedient of writing 'Western' on all occasions, employing inverted commas to show that the word is used in an unnatural or, I would venture to say, in a 'Pickwickian' sense.[1]

It is difficult to think clearly or to arrive at a correct conclusion, if words are not used in their plain sense. This is especially true if the words thus misused convey a prejudice or contain a *suggestio falsi.* As Dr. Salmon says,[2] when discussing Hort's 'question-begging' nomenclature, 'a scientific nomenclature ought to be neutral: it ought to aim at simply representing the facts without assuming the truth of any theory about them'. The wisdom of these words appears to me indisputable. From this point, therefore, wherever a common term is required to describe the text of the family to which *D* belongs, I shall substitute for 'Western' the non-committal symbol *Z* and denote the reading of the four uncials ℵ*ABC* by Γ (= *Graeci*). The symbol *Z* will be used only in the Introduction and other discussions, not in the Apparatus Criticus, where the separate authorities are given.

§ 2. *The special problem of Acts.*

I now come to the main problem of the Acts, viz. the existence of a longer text in *Z* and a shorter one in Γ. The question is, whether the extra matter found in *Z* (i.e. in *D* and allies, or in *D* without allies, or in allies without *D*) is genuine or due to interpolation. In order to illustrate my meaning, I select one case out of a multitude, not especially striking or important, but interesting, since the passage occurs in the sections preserved by the Michigan papyrus.

[1] A similar objection applies to the use of 'African' to describe certain old-Latin MSS. of the N.T. As Souter remarks (*Text and Canon of N T.*, p. 40), 'It may be that the text, which for purposes of convenience we call 'African', really took its rise in Europe: we cannot say'.

[2] *Some thoughts on the textual criticism of the N.T.*, 1897, p. 43.

In xix. 14 *D* gives:

> και εισελθοντες προς τον δαιμονιζομενō
> ηρξαντο επικαλεισθαι το ονομα λεγοντες
> παραγγελλομεν σοι εν ιηῡ
> ον παυλος εξελθειν κηρυσσει

(In the last line ἐξ. κηρ. is a scribal error for κηρ. ἐξ.) *D* is here supported by *c. Th.*, Ephrem, and Cassiodorus. The reading, therefore, clearly belongs to *Z*. The whole passage is absent from Γ, *cett.*

The Michigan papyrus has:

> και εισελθοντες
> προς δαιμονιζομενον ηρξ[αντο επι]
> καλεισθαι το ονομα λεγοντες π[αραγγελ]
> λομεν σοι εν ιηῡ ον παυλος ο [αποστο]
> λος κηρυσσει εξελθειν

Is this passage genuine or not? I ask the reader to judge.

I now pass to various theories which have been put forward about the *Z* text and its relation to Γ.

(1) The distinctive readings of *Z* are due to interpolation. The holders of this view maintain that in the early ages of the Church the text of the N.T. was not looked upon as sacred and that a great deal of what they euphemistically call 'free-handling' took place, various Christians making alterations and additions as they thought fit.[1] Thus Hort says, 'Early in the second century we find the Western text already wandering into greater and greater adulteration of the Apostolic text, which, while doubtless holding its ground in different places, has its securest refuge at Alexandria' (ii, p. 145).

It may be remarked that this theory of 'free-handling' in very ancient times is quite incompatible with the testimony of Irenaeus and Tertullian, to which reference has already been made. Ropes, with whom I entirely agree, rejects this explanation. He points out that 'In the first place it has an unmistakably homogeneous character. Secondly, its hundreds or thousands of variants are now known to have arisen in a brief period, scarcely, if at all, longer than the fifty years after the book first passed into circulation' (p. viii).

(2) Both *Z* and Γ proceed from the author, who produced two editions of his work.

[1] Ropes (p. cclvi) says that 'the text of *B* seems to belong to the period of earlier and freer variation': so (p. cciv) he joins it with *D* and ℵ in connexion with 'free variation, both accidental and deliberate'. This seems to imply that 'free-handling' was a merit, a view to which I cannot subscribe. The text of *B*ℵ appears to me to be the work of a scholarly reviser.

The first person who made this suggestion appears to have been the Dutch scholar, J. Clericus, an able critic who was much interested in Biblical texts. It may, however, be noticed that he rejected his own suggestion in favour of (1). As recent writers do not give the reference to the passage in the voluminous works of Clericus, it may be worth while to quote his words:[1]

> 'Nimirum potuit esse duplex editio Actorum ab ipso Luca procurata, quorum una altera fuit emendatior et purior. At idem dicendum foret de quattuor Evangeliis ubi similes occurrunt in eo codice (i.e. *D*) varietates, quod mihi nullo modo vero consentaneum videtur. Vel hoc codice non proprie continetur simplex textus sed quaedam potius Paraphrasis ... Sed ne hoc quidem satis veri simile videtur, quamvis hoc potius concesserim quam geminam fuisse horum librorum editionem ab ipsis Apostolis procuratam.'

It is possible that Hort had this passage in mind, when, without referring to Clericus, he mentions and rejects the theory of a 'first and second edition of the Gospels, both conceivably apostolic' (ii, p. 177).

The view which was rejected by Clericus was accepted by Blass, who has made it famous.[2] He supposed that the first edition of the Acts (= *Z*) was written in Rome, and the second (= Γ) was written in the East, for Theophilus who lived there. He uses the symbol β for his *editio Romana* and α for the *editio Orientalis*. We should have expected him to reverse these symbols. Blass developed his theory with great skill and learning, and, if the Acts stood alone, it would possess considerable plausibility. The problem, however, is not confined to Acts. Blass went on to the third Gospel,[3] where *D* is conspicuous for omissions rather than additions. In this case he found it necessary to reverse the parts and thought that the *editio Romana* was represented by Γ. In his *editio phil.* of Acts (p. 33) he suggests that there were two editions of Mark. Similar discrepancies exist, though in a less acute form, in other parts of the N.T. We cannot, however, suppose that all the authors concerned issued two editions of their works. The fatal objection to Blass's theory in the case of Acts was pointed out by Corssen[4] soon after the appearance of his work, viz. that *Z* and Γ often contradict each other. Some striking examples will be given later on (pp. xlviii–l). I would draw particular

[1] *Sentiments de quelques Théologiens de Hollande*, 1685, *Ep.* xvii (p. 451), dated Nov. 2, 1684. The letter is addressed to Origen by Critobulus (= Clericus) of Hierapolis.

[2] *Acta Apostolorum, editio philologica*, 1895; *Acta Apostolorum, secundum formam quae videtur Romanam*, 1896.

[3] *Evangelium secundum Lucam, secundum formam quae videtur Romanam*, 1897.

[4] *Götting. gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1896, pp. 425–48.

attention to xx. 4. Corssen also points out that there is a stylistic difference between the two strains:

> 'auf der einen (*Z*) Seite ein in Breite und Weitschweifigkeit übergehendes Bestreben nach Deutlichkeit, auf der andern (Γ) ein entschiedener Hang zur Kürze, selbst auf Kosten der Klarheit, hervortritt.'

(3) I now come to the *constitutio causae* as laid down by Ropes. This is that one of the rival texts is derived from the other, either *Z* from Γ, or Γ from *Z*. I entirely agree with him in this statement of the case, but not in his solution. It has been seen that he states with the utmost candour the evidence for the superior antiquity and wide diffusion of *Z*, also that the evidence for the '*B*-text' is nearly all from Alexandria or at least from Egypt. As Alexandria was the centre of textual criticism, the suspicion must arise that the text which is so closely associated with it was a scholarly recension which superseded an unrevised text.

Ropes says briefly (p. ccviii) that 'under some influence (we may guess that this was not unconnected with Origen) and before the time of Athanasius, the old *B*-text won the day in Alexandria over the old "Western" text, was used as the chief basis of the revision made in Antioch, was employed by Jerome for the revision of the Latin translation, and later showed its position of full authority in Egypt'. As he has produced no evidence to show that the *B*-text was 'old', this description of it is a *petitio principii.* The arguments upon which he relies are wholly subjective. He tells us that 'if a reviser had had the Old Uncial text of Acts at his disposal, and had wished to rewrite it, so as to make it fuller, smoother and more emphatic, and as interesting and pictorial as he could, and if he had had no materials whatever except the text before him and the inferences he could draw from it, together with the usual religious commonplaces, it must be admitted that moderate ingenuity and much taking of pains would have enabled him to produce the "Western" text. On the other hand, the reverse of this process is difficult to make reasonable' (p. ccxxv). Shortly afterwards he says that 'to most modern readers the Book of Acts in its "Western" dress will seem inferior to the original in dignity, force and charm'. I find these statements very singular. It might be expected that he would produce other examples of 'expansion', such as that which he ascribes to *Z*. Instead, however, of doing so, he quotes in a note on p. ccxxiv an example of the opposite process, saying, 'An interesting contrast is offered by the abbreviation of the Syriac Didascalia in Codex *h* (Harris's MS. of 1036), where the abridging process results in a thinner and less clear sense'.

In order to put the facts before the reader, I quote two typical examples.

x. 25. *D* has here (with *c. Th.*, 𝔏g):

πpoσεγγιζοντος δε του πετρου
εις την καισαριαν
προδραμων εις των δουλων
διεσαφησεν παραγεγονεναι αυτον
ο δε κορνηλιος εκπηδησας
και συναντησας αυτω

The reading of Γ, *cett.* is:

ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν τὸν Πέτρον, συναντήσας αὐτῷ

xix. 1. *D* has (with the Michigan papyrus, *c. Th.*, and Ephrem):

θελοντος δε του παυλου
κατα την ιδιαν βουλην
πορευεσθαι εις ιεροσολυμα
ειπεν αυτω το πν̄α υποστρεφειν εις την ασιᾱ

The reading of Γ, *cett.* is:

ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν Ἀπόλλω εἶναι ἐν Κορίνθῳ Παῦλον

In both cases the reading of Γ seems to be a tame abbreviation. Where is its 'dignity, force and charm'? Which of these variants could most easily be derived from the other? I appeal to any unprejudiced reader.

Having decided, against the evidence which he has stated with such candour, that *Z* is an expansion of the 'Old-B text', Ropes goes on to construct its pedigree. In view of its 'unmistakably homogeneous internal character' he considers it to be due to 'definite rewriting' by a single person, not to 'an accumulation of miscellaneous variants'. He draws attention to the fact that it contains a number of Hebraisms and certain agreements with the Hebrew Old Testament as against the Septuagint. His conclusion is 'that the "Western" text was made before and perhaps long before the year 150 by a Greek-speaking Christian who knew something of Hebrew, in the East, probably Palestine' (p. ccxliv). He gives no reason for its speedy triumph over the 'Old-B text', its diffusion over all parts of the Roman world and the confidence expressed by Irenaeus and Tertullian in the security of the text which they used.

There are indications that Ropes was not without qualms about this theory of the *Z* text, since there are readings which he is forced to accept, however much against the grain. He speaks of these as 'fossils enshrined in an enveloping rock-mass' and as fragments of 'a good text of extreme antiquity, vastly nearer to the original autographs than any of our Greek MSS.' (p. ix; cf. p. ccxl). This theory enables him to accept isolated *Z* readings, while rejecting the long passages of extra matter furnished by *D* and its allies.

Ropes appears to have an alternative explanation of the 'Western' text. This is stated most fully in pp. ccxlv–vi, where he says, 'It is tempting to

suggest that the "Western" text was made when Christian books, valued for their antiquity and worth, were gathered and disseminated in a collection which afterwards became the New Testament, and that the two processes were part of the same great event, perhaps at Antioch—in other words that the "Western" text was the original "canonical" text (if the anachronism be pardoned) which was later supplanted by a "pre-canonical" text of superior age and merit. *But such a theory involves many considerations and would have grave consequences for the earliest history of the N.T. canon*, and it cannot be discussed in the present Essay.'

I do not feel quite sure what is meant by these remarks, and would only say that possible 'consequences to the history of the N.T. canon', whether grave or otherwise, should not deter us from seeking for the truth. It is more important to discover this than to bolster up antiquated theories.

(4) I proceed to the remaining alternative, viz. that Γ is derived from *Z*.

The first person to suggest this was F. A. Bornemann.[1] His view was that the longer text represents the first draft of the Acts, which was preserved in the archives of the Church at Jerusalem, and that the omissions in the shorter text, which was afterwards published, were due to *homoeoteleuton* (ὁμ.). It is undoubtedly true that in certain cases ὁμ. is a sufficient explanation. To take a simple case, in iv. 32 *D* has:

ην καρδια και ψυχη μια
και ουκ ην διακρισις εν αυτοις ουδεμια

The second στίχος is omitted by Γ, *cett.* (except *E*), but is found in the quotations of Cyprian, Ambrose, and Zeno. Its disappearance seems due to the occurrence of μια at the end of both στ.

A more striking case is to be found in xi. 1–2, where a long passage occupying seven στίχοι in *D*, which has some Latin and Syriac support, is omitted by Γ, *cett.* The explanation is that the writer passed from τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, which precedes the passage, to τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ, which comes at the end of it.

It is not necessary to mention here other cases where ὁμ. is a sufficient cause for omission. Some of Bornemann's examples are somewhat forced. In the majority of omitted passages ὁμ. does not exist. Some further cause for omission is needed.

I have now to mention a work of my own, written when I was beginning my study of the subject.[2] When comparing Scrivener's transcript of *D* with the ordinary text of the Acts, I noticed a fact which struck me as

[1] *Acta Apostolorum*, Grossenhain and London, 1848.
[2] *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*, Oxford, 1914.

highly curious, namely that extra matter found in *D* but absent from Γ frequently coincides with line-division in *D*, i.e. it occupies complete lines in *D*. This phenomenon is peculiar to the Acts, in which I noticed some 40 cases. The portion of the Acts preserved in *D* consists of 88 pages: the Gospels cover 324 pages. We should, therefore, expect to find in them about 150 such cases. As a matter of fact, however, I could only point to 14 examples, few of which were at all striking.

The importance of this observation must be visible to any one who has studied the filiation of MSS. When we find that words omitted by one MS. are contained in a complete line of another MS., the suspicion arises that a scribe has omitted a line of his model. If this occurs several times, suspicion is changed to certainty. There is, however, a complication in the case of *D*, viz. that it is written in what are more or less 'sense-lines', and it may be argued that an interpolation would naturally form a στίχος or several. I, therefore, at first regarded these cases of simple omission (or addition) with some reserve. My attention was chiefly arrested by an instance in which the writer appears to have passed from a particular point in one στίχος to the corresponding point in another, omitting what came between. This occurs in xv. 29, where *D* has:

ευ πραξατε φερομενοι
εν τω αγιω πν̄ι ερρωσθε

The words φερόμενοι . . . πν̄ι are supported by Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cassiodorus, and Ephrem. They are, however, omitted by all MSS. except *D*.

With this may be compared another passage which I noticed subsequently, viz. xviii. 12, where *D* gives:

οι ιουδαιοι συλλαλησαντες
μεθ εαυτων επι τον παυλον

The words συλλ. μεθ' ἑαυτῶν occur also in 𝔏h, but are omitted by all other MSS.

The evidence to which I attach most importance is furnished by various passages in which Γ, *cett.* appear to have been 'botched' or mended, to make a construction after an omission. Botching under these circumstances is a familiar device, and may occur in any MS. I have noticed in the Acts certain passages where *D* appears to have been botched after omitting words preserved by Γ.

The significance of this evidence may be judged from the following select cases:

ii. 30 κατα σαρκα αναστησαι τον χ̄ρ̄ν
και καθισαι επι τον θρονον αυτου

D is supported by δ, 𝔖ph, *Orig.* Γ, *cett.* omit στ. 1 and καί in στ. 2.

ii. 37 τοτε παντες οι συνελθοντες
και ακουσαντες κατενυγησαν τη καρδια

D is supported by *c. Th.* Γ, *cett.* omit στ. 1 and have ἀκούσ. δέ in στ. 2, to give a construction.

iii. 3 ουτος ατενισας τοις οφθαλμοις αυτου
και ιδων πετρον και ιωανην

D is supported by $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$. Γ, *cett.* omit στ. 1 and have ὃς ἰδών in στ. 2.

xiv. 19 διατριβοντων αυτων και διδασκοντων
επηλθον τινες ιουδαιοι

D is supported by *c. Th.*, *CE*, and $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: ℵ *AB cett.* omit στ. 1 and insert δέ after ἐπῆλθον.

xv. 12 συνκατατεθεμενων δε των πρεσβυτερῶ
τοις υπο του πετρου ειρημενοις
εσειγησεν παν το πληθος

D is supported by $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ and Ephrem: Γ, *cett.* omit στ. 1–2 and insert δέ after ἐσίγησεν.

xxi. 25 περι δε των πεπιστευκοτων εθνων
ουδεν εχουσι λεγειν προς σε
ημεις γαρ απεστειλαμεν κρεινοντες

D is supported by $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and the Sahidic: Γ, *cett.* omit στ. 2 and obtain a construction by omitting γάρ in στ. 3.

These cases are sufficient to illustrate the point. Equally decisive examples are to be found in ii. 1, iii. 1, xi. 27, xvi. 1, xxi. 22. Others, slightly more complicated, occur in iv. 18, xiii. 44, xv. 5, xvi. 35, xvii. 15. A special case of great interest, which occurs in xx. 12, will be discussed subsequently (p. liii).

It is on these 'botched' passages that I chiefly relied to prove the priority of the longer version. To me the evidence which they give seems decisive, and I appeal with some confidence to the judgement of textual critics.

The conclusion to which I came was that 'behind all our MSS. we have an archetype arranged in στίχοι similar to those which are found in *D*' (p. 90).

At this point I would refer to some remarks made by Scrivener upon the past history of *D*. He shows by a number of errors that *D* 'both on the Latin and on the Greek pages *was copied from an older model similarly divided in respect to the lines and verses*' (p. xxiii.). Elsewhere he says of the Greek text, as compared with the Latin, that in his belief 'it bears distinct traces of an origin far more remote. Itself immediately derived from a MS. whose stichometry was arranged just like its own, it must ultimately be referred to an exemplar wherein the verses, now so irregular

and confused, were first distributed according to an orderly system, and such an original would most likely belong to the third century at the latest' (p. lxiv). My own analysis has convinced me that both *D* and 𝔏^{d} have behind them a series of ancestors written in similar formation.

It is allowed by such thoroughgoing antagonists of *D* as Hort, Scrivener, and Ropes, that *D*, apart from corruptions and interpolations, presents us with what is substantially a second-century text. On the hypothesis that the Γ text was the product of a later period, the possibility that it was descended from an ancestor arranged in *στίχοι* must be seriously considered. As a matter of fact, in addition to the omissions and consequential botchings already mentioned, there is a quantity of other evidence, which will be subsequently produced.

In my early work I restricted myself to accident as a cause of omission, and only made cautious references to abbreviation. I confined myself to the conclusions suggested by the evidence at my disposal, which pointed to the omission of lines. Thus Sanday, when dealing with the Bobbio MS. (𝔏^{k}) of Mt. and Mk., ascribed some of its numerous omissions to deliberate abbreviation.[1] As, however, the omitted passages showed the operation of a regular unit, I preferred to suppose that lines of the model had been omitted.

In a later work,[2] dealing chiefly with classical and patristic texts, I called attention to some remarkable facts which I had observed in the course of my investigations. The subject with which I was mainly concerned was that of omissions in MSS., whether due to accident or to abbreviation. When dealing with certain shorter texts, I made what was to me a surprising discovery, viz. that, in some cases at any rate, an ancient abbreviator went on the rough and ready method of striking out lines in his model, botching where necessary in order to produce sense.

In the most ancient MSS. very few abbreviations were used. Consequently lines tended to contain a similar or the same number of letters. If occasional lines are slightly longer or shorter, the average soon asserts itself. Thus, on taking twenty pages in the palimpsest of Cicero, *De Re Publica*, written in two columns, I found that the left-hand columns in these pages contained 3,057 letters and the right-hand columns 3,055.[3] I pass over a vast body of similar evidence and would only remark that even in comparatively late MSS., in which abbreviations are very frequent, exact agreements are also to be found. I illustrate from a single instance. In the British Museum MS. Harl. 3063, cent. ix, two omissions (and

[1] *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, ii, pp. 119–21. Cf. *Primitive Text*, pp. 43–7.

[2] *The Descent of MSS.* (1918).

[3] l. c., p. 12.

two only) of the scribe have been supplied by the corrector, who has affixed to them the mark (*h̄*) to show that omission has taken place.[1]

f. 56r eo qđ necdũ reb: ipsis in illis sumus sed interĩ credim: de illis promissionẽ ũo (= 66 letters).

f. 78v quale ẽ illud qđ dix̄ p̃elegit nos adhuc etiã et affectũ de reb: hui'modi implens ostendit. Nã qđ dix̄ in caritate 7 secundũ bonũ placitũ uoluntatis sue hęc ostendit (= 132 letters).

Here 66 × 2 = 132. The scribe omitted one line of his model on f. 56r and two lines on f. 78v.

I do not propose to discuss here the value of this arithmetical test in cases where passages which are omitted by some MSS., possibly by what is called the 'best' MS., are found in others which do not enjoy so high a reputation.

After this explanation, I take what is undoubtedly an abridged text.[2] This is found in a palimpsest leaf, *Taur. A.* II. 2*, containing Cic. *ad Fam.* vi. 9. 1 to 10. 6. Whereas it is usual to find in palimpsests passages omitted in later MSS., this fragment has a series of omissions. Also, there are indications that the text was doctored in places after omission. It is clear that it is the work of an epitomator. Krüger suggests that it may have been made by Fronto, who speaks of making excerpts from Cicero's letters. The cuts made in the palimpsest vary in length and character. The most interesting case is in vi. 10. 1, where the MSS. give:

> Itaque et Postumuleno et Sestio et saepissime Attico nostro proximeque Theudae, liberto tuo, totum me patefeci et haec eis singulis saepe dixi, quacumque re possem, me tibi et liberis tuis satis facere cupere, idque ad tuos velim scribas, haec quidem certe quae in potestate mea sunt ut operam consilium rem fidem meam sibi ad omnes res paratam putent. Si auctoritate et gratia tantum possem.

For all this the palimpsest has:

> Itaque si auctoritate et gratia tantum possem (*om. med.*).

The omission is disguised by joining *Itaque* to the next sentence. The abbreviator was not interested in such obscure persons as Postumulenus and Theudas.

A similar case is:

> 9. 2 ut non ullo eum homine coniunctius viverem. Nihil attinet me plura scribere: quam mihi necesse sit eius salutem et fortunas quibuscunque rebus possim tueri vides. Relicum est ut cum cognorim.

The palimpsest after *viverem* omits *nihil . . . tueri* and goes on with *Vides relicum esse* (for *est*) *ut cum cognorim.*

[1] l. c., p. 53. [2] l. c., pp. 147–53.

A more impudent example of botching is in 10. 2, where the palimpsest omits a long passage (*tibi et illa polliceor . . . esse tam difficile*), which occupies fifteen and a half lines in the Teubner text, and botches by the insertion of three words *nihil erit saltem* in their place.

There are also minor omissions without botching.

I happened to apply the arithmetical test to the omitted passages and the intervening blocks of texts retained in the palimpsest, and at once noticed some singular facts. The first passage which is omitted, viz. *nihil attinet . . . tueri* (9. 2), consists of 94 letters, while the block of text *quid tu et . . . fieri intelligo* in the same section, which comes between two short omissions (*pluribus verbis* and *hoc mihi . . . vale*), consists of 187 letters.[1] The relation between 94 and 187 is somewhat remarkable. The next omitted passage is the interesting one about Postumulenus and others already cited. This I found to contain 284 letters ($94 \times 3 = 282$).

These agreements cannot be due to chance. The unit, however, cannot be 94. The model is not likely to have had longer lines than the palimpsest itself, which has an average of 37 letters to the line.

Armed with this clue I examined the remaining contents of the leaf. For full details I refer to my discussion of the subject. It will be enough here to say that a unit of 31 appears to pervade both omitted and retained passages. To illustrate this I give the larger figures, marking with an asterisk those portions which are found in the palimpsest as well as in the MSS. Those which are not thus marked are passages found in the MSS. but absent from the palimpsest. I arrange in order of length.

(94) Nihil attinet . . . possim tueri (9. 2).
(187) *Quid tu . . . fieri intelligo (9. 2).
(217) *Si auctoritate . . . uterque cecidit (10. 2).
(284) Et Postumuleno . . . paratam putent (10. 1).
(310) *Ego quanti . . . mei itaque (10. 1).
(399) *Quod non pro . . . esse versatum (10. 3–4).
(676) Tibi et illa . . . tam difficile (10. 2–3).

Here $31 \times 3 = 93$, $31 \times 6 = 186$, $31 \times 7 = 217$, $31 \times 9 = 279$, $31 \times 10 = 310$, $31 \times 13 = 403$, $31 \times 22 = 682$.

I now turn to evidence of a different kind,[2] which is furnished by the speech of Demosthenes against Meidias, in which there is a long series of obelizations, generally common to three MSS., *SBF.* The meaning of these obels has been much discussed. W. Christ thought that they were affixed on subjective grounds by a critic whose abilities he does not rate highly. On one occasion he thinks that this person wished to abridge

[1] In this passage the palimpsest has *sentias* for *sentires* (*cett.*) and *es* for *esses* (*cett.*). If these readings are attributed to the model, the total number of letters is 183.

[2] l. c., pp. 439–45.

a passage (§ 99). Blass appears to have treated the obelizations more seriously. In his text the passages thus marked are printed in smaller letters. This arrangement suggests that they are not genuine.

In view of previous experience I thought it worth while to examine the length of some of the shorter passages. I took first the shortest one which I could find:

§ 49 *καὶ πολλοὺς ἤδη παραβάντας τὸν νόμον τοῦτον ἐζημιώκασι θανάτωι* (= 54).

The next obelized passage is:

§ 86 *τὴν μὲν δίαιταν ἀντιλαχὼν οὐκ ὤμοσεν, ἀλλ' εἴασε καθ' ἑαυτοῦ κυρίαν γενέσθαι καὶ ἀνώμοτος ἀπηνέχθη· βουλόμενος δὲ τὸ μέλλον λαθεῖν* (= 107)

No result could be more suggestive. I was, therefore, encouraged to examine in the same way all the obelized passages in the speech and, where several of these occur in proximity to each other, the intermediate blocks of text. I will illustrate this from §§ 86–92. Here we have three obelized passages, the first of which has already been quoted in full, and two intervening blocks of text. I mark obelized passages with an asterisk and affix no mark to the blocks of text.

§ 86 **τὴν μὲν δίαιταν . . . λαθεῖν* (107).
§§ 86–7 *φυλάξας τήν . . . ἔστ' ἀσφαλές* (448).
§§ 88–92 **δεῖ δή . . . ἄκυρον ποιεῖ* (1374).
§ 92 *καίτοι εἰ . . . παραβαίνοντος* (157).
§ 92 **εἰ γάρ . . . θάνατος φαίνεται* (110).

It may be observed that shortly afterwards in § 99 there is another obelized passage which also consists of 110 letters (*ἀλλ' ἴστε . . . δίκην διδόντας*). The relation of 110 *bis* to 107 and 54 is striking.

The conclusion to which I came, after examining all the passages, was that 54 is not a unit, but a multiple (= 27 × 2). I have generally found in similar calculations that the unit varies somewhat in the smaller numbers and becomes more constant in the large. In the case of this speech multiples of 26 account for a large proportion of the figures.

Here we may notice that 26 × 6 = 156, 26 × 17 = 442, 26 × 65 = 1378.

Similar groups of obelized passages occur in §§ 99–101, 134–8, and 191–218. The last of these is the most complicated, consisting of seven obelized passages and six intervening blocks. It would occupy too much space to discuss these here, so I will content myself with referring any one who is interested by these remarks to the full details and conspectus of figures which I have given in my book (p. 444). It will be sufficient to say here that the unit of 26 to which I have called attention occurs with considerable regularity and exactness. I would illustrate from the

two largest figures, both of which concern intervening blocks. These are:

§§ 193–7 οἶμαι τοίνυν . . . τοῦτον τοιοῦτον (1510).
§§ 134–9 εἰ μὲν γάρ . . . ἐπινευόντων (1688).

Here we may notice that $26 \times 58 = 1508$ and $26 \times 65 = 1690$.

In some cases where the unit does not work out so exactly, there are some interesting agreements and sequences. Thus the number 507 occurs twice, once for an intermediate block (§§ 98–9 καὶ τί φήσετε . . . τοῦτο λοιπόν) and once for an obelized passage (§§ 217–18 πάντα γάρ . . . τινὸς ἡττῆσθαι). This is very extraordinary and can hardly be due to chance. The unit here works out not at 26, but at 26·5.

The natural interpretation to put on these figures is that an ancient critic who wished to abridge this speech obelized passages which generally, though, of course, not always, coincided with lines in his text. If so, these obelizations reveal an abridged text in the act of making.

In consequence of the new light cast by this and other evidence upon methods of abbreviation,[1] I found it necessary to modify the view which I had previously expressed concerning the shorter text of Acts, viz. that it was formed from the longer by the omission of στίχοι. I venture to quote from the Preface to my later work (p. xii), where I said:

'Formerly I spoke of abridgement with caution, and only in connexion with the longer cuts, since it did not occur to me that an abbreviator would deliberately reduce his text by the excision of lines. I therefore treated all the omissions of *B* ℵ, &c., as due to accident. In view of the new evidence as to the methods of abbreviators, I now think that many of them may have been deliberate. This removes certain difficulties, since it seemed strange that a copyist should be so careless.'

My subsequent studies have led me to speak more confidently. I now look upon the excisions as in the main the work of an abbreviator, though

[1] For similar abridgements in the case of prose authorities I would refer to other cases mentioned in the same work, viz. Primasius (pp. 40, 104–23), Plato's Ὅροι (pp. 394–5), and Theaetetus (p. 403). The most singular case of wholesale abridgement (without botching) is to be found in what is considered to be the best MS. of Horace, *Bernensis* 363, cent. ix (pp. 27–31). The result of these cuts is sometimes highly comic. Thus *Sat.* i. 3. 90–101 is compressed into five lines, viz.:

90 comminxit lectum potus mensave catillum
91 Evandri manibus tritum deiecit ob hanc rem
93 sustulit esuriens minus hoc iucundus amicus
94 sit mihi? quid faciam si furtum fecerit aut si
101 unguibus et pugnis dein fustibus atque ita porro.

This abridged text is obviously a curiosity, and I do not use it to support the conclusions which I have advanced above.

accidental omission must also be taken into account, especially if facilitated by ὁμοιότης.

The hypothesis of deliberate abbreviation removes a further difficulty of which I was fully conscious. This is that the rival texts differ in character as well as in length. The longer text is more picturesque and more circumstantial, the shorter is more colourless and in places more obscure. It was difficult to see how this difference in style could result from a series of accidental omissions. This difficulty vanishes, if the shorter text was the work of an abbreviator whose mentality was different from that of the original writer. It may be remarked that some of the obscurities in the ordinary text are due to the excision of matter necessary to the sense. Abridgements are always tame and tend to become obscure.[1]

§ 3. *D omits passages found in other authorities.*

I now come to omissions of *D*. These fall into two classes, viz. (*a*) passages which are found in Γ, *cett.* (or *plerique*), and (*b*) passages which are found in other representatives of *Z*, especially *c. Th.* and 𝔏ʰ, but omitted by *D*, as well as by Γ. In both cases a very striking fact is to be observed, viz. that with few exceptions the extra matter comes at the end of a στίχος in *D*.

(*a*) I take first some special cases:

ii. 30–1 και καθισαι επι τον θρονον αυτου
αναστασεως του χ̄ρ̄ῡ

So *D*, without sense. Γ, *cett.* add προϊδὼν ἐλάλησε περὶ τῆς after αὐτοῦ. The missing words are added to στ. 1 by a corrector in *D*.

xiii. 3 και επιθεντες τας χειρας αυτοις
οι μεν ουν εκπεμφθεντες υπο του π̄ν̄ς̄ αγιου

After αὐτοῖς Γ δ add ἀπέλυσαν, while *E*, 𝔏ᵍᵖ, 𝔖, *Ambr. Hier.* add ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς. If we attribute the second of these readings to a parent of *D*, the omission is assisted by ὁμ.

xvii. 34 εν οις και διονυσιος τις αρεοπαγειτης
ευσχημων και ετεροι συν αυτοις

After the end of στ. 1 Γ, *cett.* add καὶ γυνὴ ὀνόματι Δάμαρις. The epithet

[1] Since this was written my attention has been called by Canon Streeter to a paper by Prof. R. P. Casey upon the Athens text of Athanasius *Contra Gentes* and *De Incarnatione*, published in *Harvard Theol. Review*, Jan. 1930, pp. 51–89. He finds that the Athens text contains a 'short' recension as opposed to the 'long' recension represented in Migne, and considers the 'long' recension to be original and the Athens text to be a revision of it. He tells us that 'in some cases the omissions do not disturb the sense, in others an adaptation of the text was necessary to conceal the gap': also, that 'the omissions impoverish the sentence and make it abrupt and harsh'.

εὐσχήμων is especially used of a 'lady'. Damaris has disappeared from *D*, but left her certificate of respectability behind.

xxi. 16 *αναβαινομεν εις ιεροσολυμα*
εκ κεσαραιας συν ημιν

D is now mutilated here, but its reading is attested by former collators, also by the rendering of 𝔏[d].

Γ, *cett.* after *στ.* 1 add *συνῆλθον δὲ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν*, which is necessary to the sense. Ropes here remarks that *D* has omitted a line.

In two cases the omission is due to 'looking forward' on the part of the scribe, with consequential fusion of two *στίχοι*.

xi. 26. The model of *D* must have had:

συνεχυθησαν [*εν τη εκκλησια*
και εδιδαξαν] *οχλον ικανον*

D omits the words bracketed. The omission is due to *δμ*.

xix. 27. The model must have had:

αλλα καθερισθαι μελλει
[*η μεγαλειοτης αυτης ην*] *η ολη ασια*

D omits the words bracketed.

In all the above-mentioned cases nonsense is produced.

In other cases where *στίχοι* have been omitted the injury to the sense is not so obvious, e.g. ii. 18–20. For the sake of brevity I supplement the *στίχοι* of *D* with additions from Γ placed in brackets:

και εγω επι τους δουλους μου
και επι τας δουλας μου
[*εν ταις ημεραις εκειναις*]
εκχεω απο του π̄ν̄ς μου
[*και προφητευσουσιν*]
και δωσω τερατα εν τω ουρανω ανω
και σημεια επι της γης κατω
[*αιμα και πυρ και ατμιδα καπνου*]
ο ηλιος μεταστρεφεται εις σκοτος
και η σεληνη εις αιμα
πριν ελθειν ημεραν κ̄ῡ την μεγαλην
[*και επιφανη*]

Further details will be found in the App. Crit.

As a rule these omissions are isolated, e.g.:

xvii. 18 *οιδεν* (= *οι δε*) *ξενων δαιμονιων*
δοκει καταγγελευς ειναι
[*οτι τον ῑη̄ν και την αναστασιν ευηγγελιζετο*]

xviii. 3 *εμενεν προς αυτους και ηργαζετο*
[*ησαν γαρ σκηνοποιοι τη τεχνη*]

ib. 27 ος επιδημησας εις την αχαιαν
πολυν συνεβαλλετο εν ταις εκκλησιαις
[τοις πεπιστευκοσι δια της χαριτος]

The last instance is peculiarly interesting, since στ. 3 is also omitted by the Michigan papyrus. It cannot, however, be dispensed with, since a dat. is required after συνεβάλλετο. The agreement of *pap.* only shows that the στ. was omitted at an early date.

Some of the shorter passages found in Γ, *cett.*, but omitted by *D* at the end of a στ., are striking, e. g.

vi. 9 και κυρηνεων και αλεξανδρεων
και των απο κιλικιας
[και ασιας]

The omission of στ. 3 is helped by ὁμ.

xvi. 36 ινα απολυθητε νυν ουν
εξελθοντες πορευεσθαι
[εν ειρηνη].

In some cases *D* appears to have been botched after the loss of a στ., e. g.

xi. 2 οι δε εκ περιτομης αδελφοι διεκρινοντο
προς αυτον λεγοντες

Before στ. 1 Γ, *cett.* add ὅτε δὲ ἀνέβη Πέτρος εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, and omit δέ in στ. 1. The addition is necessary to the sense.

In the previous seven στίχοι—which are omitted by Γ—the work of Peter in the villages (διὰ τῶν χωρῶν) is described. The speech which follows was clearly delivered at Jerusalem. The insertion of δέ in *D* was consequential to the omission of ὅτε δὲ . . . Ἱερουσ.

xix. 21 τοτε παυλος εθετο εν τω πν̅ι̅
διελθειν την μακεδονιαν

Γ, *cett.* have ὡς δὲ ἐπληρώθη ταῦτα in place of τότε. I regard the fuller variant as authentic, and τότε as an attempt at botching.

Other cases will be found in xx. 26, xxi. 5.

The few cases which at first sight appear to be recalcitrant generally admit of a simple explanation, e. g.

iv. 1 επεστησαν οι ειερεις και οι σαδδουκαιοι
καιαπονουμενοι

Γ, *cett.* (except 𝔏g) have καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ after οἱ ἱερεῖς. It is easy to suppose that in an ancestor of *D* the words occupied an intermediate στίχος.

xxi. 39 εγω ανθρωπος μεν ειμι ιουδαιος
εν ταρσω δε της κιλικιας γεγεννημενος

Here *D* omits the famous words οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως πολίτης, which in Γ, *cett.* come after Κιλικίας (*om.* γεγεννημένος). They appear to have occupied a third στ. after γεγενν. Ropes here remarks that 'the omission in *D* is probably due to the accidental omission of a line in the archetype'.

In some cases where omission in *D* is due to 'looking forward' from one στ. to another, στ. have been fused. Simple instances of this (xi. 26, xix. 27) have already been given. Others are:

ii. 41 οι μεν ουν πιστευσαντες τον λογον αυτου
εβαπτισθησαν

Here there is clearly some error, since the acc. is not used after πιστεύω. Γ, *cett.* have ἀποδεξάμενοι, or ἀσμένως ἀποδ. instead of πιστεύσαντες. An ancestor of *D* appears to have had

οι μεν ουν πιστευσαντες
[ασμενως αποδεξαμενοι] τον λογον αυτου κτλ.

x. 27 και εισελθων τε και ευρεν συνεληλυθοτας πολλους

This στ. is unusually long (41 letters). The grammar also halts, since εἰσῆλθεν (not -ελθών) would be expected before εὗρεν.

Γ, *cett.* have καὶ συνομιλῶν αὐτῷ εἰσῆλθεν καὶ εὑρίσκει συν. πολλούς. The words συνομιλῶν αὐτῷ come in neatly after καὶ εἰσελθών τε καί in *D*. If so, two (or possibly three) στ. have been fused.

(*b*) I now turn to passages where omissions of *D* are repaired from representatives of *Z*, chiefly *c. Th.* and 𝔏ʰ.

iv. 3 και επιβαλοντες αυτοις τας χειρας
και εθεντο εις τηρησιν εις την επαυριον

Here again the grammar halts. It would be easy to explain καί in στ. 2 as repeated from στ. 1. It is, however, to be noticed that 𝔏ʰ after χεῖρας adds *tenuerunt eos* (= ἐκράτησαν αὐτούς) which completes the sense and explains the grammatical irregularity in *D*.

v. 38 οτι εαν η εξ ανθρωπων η βουλη αυτη
η το εργον τουτο καταλυθησεται

𝔏ʰ adds at the end of στ. 2 *virtus eius* (= ἡ δύναμις αὐτῆς).

xii. 5 ο μεν ουν πετρος ετηρειτο εν τη φυλακη

After φυλακῇ 𝔏ᵖ and 𝔖ᵖʰ add:

ὑπὸ τῆς σπείρης τοῦ βασιλέως

ib. 25 βαρναβας δε και σαυλος

After Σαῦλος 616, 𝔏p, 𝔖ph add:

ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Παῦλος. The omission seems due to ὁμ.

xiii. 29. The longer text here rests on the combined evidence of *D* and *c.Th.*, which complete each other: Γ, *cett.* are abridged. It is to be noted that while *c.Th.* omits a στ. of *D*, it has preserved a passage omitted by *D* at the end of a στ.

ib. 43 ηκολουθησαν πολλοι των ιουδαιων
και των σεβομενων προσηλυτων
τω παυλω και βαρναβα

δ, 𝔖ph add ἀξιοῦντες βαπτισθῆναι.

xiv. 18 μογις κατεπαυσαν τους οχλους
του μη θυειν αυτοις

c.Th. *C* δ, 𝔏h add ἀλλὰ πορεύεσθαι ἕκαστον εἰς τὰ ἴδια.

ib. 19 επηλθον τινες ιουδαιοι
απο ικονιου και αντιοχιας

c.Th. *C*, 𝔏h have a long addition (καὶ διαλεγομένων . . . πάντα ψεύδονται).

ib. 20 κυκλωσαντων δε των μαθητων αυτου

𝔏h, 𝔈 add ἑσπέρας γενομένης.

xv. 6 συνηχθησαν δε οι αποστολοι και πρεσβυτεροι

After πρεσβ. δ, 𝔖ph add σὺν τῷ πλήθει.

ib. 36 τον λογον του κῡ πως εχουσιν

𝔖ph, Ephr. add ἤρεσεν δὲ ἡ βουλὴ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ.

xvii. 9 και λαβοντες το ικανον παρα του ιασωνος
και των λοιπων απελυσαν αυτους

Before στ. 1 *c.Th.* has οἱ μὲν οὖν πολιτάρχαι, which is necessary to the sense (without καί before λαβ.). Without the words the reference appears to be to the rioters.

xviii. 2 δια το τεταχεναι κλαυδιος

Before διὰ *c.Th.*, 𝔏h have οὗτοι δὲ ἐξῄεσαν ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης.

ib. οι κε (= και) κατωκησεν εις την αχαιαν

c.Th., 𝔏h add ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἐγνώσθη τῷ Ἀκύλᾳ.

xx. 24 του τελιωσαι τον δρομον μου

CE δ, 𝔖ph add μετὰ χαρᾶς.

xxi. 31 οτι ολη συνχυννεται ιερουσαλημ

𝔖ph adds ὅρα οὖν μὴ ποιῶνται ἐπανάστασιν.

xxii. 28 *και αποκριθεις ο χειλιαρχος ειπεν*

vg.[a], *cod. Bedae* (not *E*), and the Bohemian version add οὕτως εὐχερῶς σε Ῥωμαῖον λέγεις;

I take separately a case where *D* appears to have fused two στ. into one.

xx. 4. Here *c.Th.* has: μέλλοντος οὖν ἐξιέναι αὐτοῦ συνείποντο αὐτῷ μέχρι τῆς Ἀσίας Σώπατρος Πύρρου Βεροιαῖος κτλ.

D gives:

μελλοντος ουν εξειεναι αυτου μεχρι της ασιας
σωπατρος πυρρου βερυιαιος

Here the sense has been destroyed by the omission of συνείποντο αὐτῷ. An ancestor must have had

μελλοντος ουν εξιεναι αυτου
συνειποντο αυτω μεχρι της ασιας

The omission is due to ὁμ.

The most interesting of these cases are iv. 3 and xx. 4.

This list is by no means exhaustive, as I have excluded certain passages the authenticity of which seems to me doubtful.

Before quitting this subject I would point out that in the portions of Acts for which we have not the evidence of *D*, a large number of additions given by allies of *D* would naturally occupy a στίχος in a MS. written like *D*.

§ 4. *Descent of various authorities from MSS. written in στίχοι.*

I now produce certain other evidence which seems to corroborate the conclusion that our authorities are derived from MSS. written in στίχοι. To avoid undue repetition of matter discussed later on in this work, I confine myself to a few instances.

I take first Γ, *cett.*

vii. 16. *D* has:

και μετηχθησαν εις συχεν
και ετεθησαν εν τω μνηματι

For μετήχθ. in στ. 1 Γ *E* δ have μετετέθησαν from στ. 2.

x. 10. Here 𝕷[d] (*def. D*) has:

factus est autem esuriens
et bolebat gustare
praeparantibus uero ipsis
cecidit super eum mentis stupor

The same reading, i.e. ἐγένετο (*factus est*) in στ. 1 and ἐπέπεσεν (*cecidit*) in στ. 4 is found in *E* δ, 𝕷[g], 𝕾, 𝕰, while Γ has ἐγένετο from στ. 1 in place of ἐπέπεσεν.

xix. 32–3 και οι πλειστοι ουκ ηδεισαν τινος ενεκεν
συνεληλυθεισαν εκ δε του οχλου
κατεβιβασαν αλεξανδρον
προβαλλοντων αυτον των ιουδαιων

In στ. 3 κατεβ. gives a suitable sense ('drew him out of the multitude' *A.V.*). Γ has συνεβίβασαν, while δ gives προεβίβασαν. The reading of Γ is very singular. Ropes says of it 'the strangeness of συνεβίβασαν ("instructed"?) seems to have given rise to the variants'. The description of the crowd 'instructing' Alexander, when he was pushed forward by the Jews, is somewhat comic.

Blass here has a note which I reproduce:

'συνεβίβασαν intelligi nequit (estne συν ex συνεληλύθ. ortum?); προεβ. (Matt. xiv. 8) *prodire coegerunt*; sed προ quoque ex προβαλ. ortum esse vid.; κατεβίβ. (Lc. x. 15) *descendere coegerunt*, ut in theatro rectissime.'

The divination of Blass appears to be verified by the arrangement in *D*, which explains alike the readings of Γ and δ.

In some cases a corruption is found in some members of Γ, e. g.:

xiv. 3 παρησιαμενοι επι τω κω̄
τω μαρτυρουντι τω λογω της χαριτος αυτου

א *A* add ἐπί from στ. 1 before τῷ λόγῳ in στ. 2.

Such corruptions are more frequent in א than in other MSS. I quote here a single example.

xiii. 42–3 λαληθηναι αυτοις ρηματα ταυτα
λυθεισης δε της συναγωγης

א adds αὐτοῖς from στ. 1 after δέ in στ. 2.

Similar evidence is given by allies of *D*. Here again I give a selection only.

(1) Pap. Mich.

The omission by *D* and *pap.* in xviii. 27 of the words τοῖς πεπιστευκόσι διὰ τῆς χάριτος, at the end of a στ. in *D*, appears to show that *pap.* was derived from a MS. written in similar στίχοι.

(2) Latin MSS.

(*a*) *Aug.*[ab] In i. 3 *D* has

μετα το παθειν αυτον εν πολλοις τεκμηριοις
τεσσερακοντα ημερων

For this *Aug.*[ab] give:

post passionem in multis argumentis dierum per (*om. Aug.*[b]) dies quadraginta.

A writer appears to have looked forward to ἡμερῶν at the end of στ. 2.

(It is to be noticed that *Aug.*[b] agrees with *D*[1] in omitting διά before ἡμ.)

ib. 18. *D* has:

ουτος μεν ουν εκτησατο χωριον εκ μισθου
της αδικιας αυτου
και πρηνης γενομενος ελακησεν μεσος

Aug.[b] (*def. Aug.*[a]) adds after στ. 2 *et collum sibi alligavit* (= καὶ τὸν τράχηλον κατέδησεν αὐτοῦ). Here *Aug.*[b] has preserved a στ. omitted by *D*, *cett.* (ὁμ.).

(*b*) 𝔏[h]. The most significant passage is xvii. 34, where *D* has:

τινες δε ανδρες εκολληθησαν
αυτω επιστευσαν

𝔏[h] has *quidam autem crediderunt* (*med. om.*). This seems due to 'looking forward'.

xiv. 8–9 ος ουδεποτε περειπεπατηκει
ουτος ηκουσεν του παυλου λαλουντος
υπαρχων εν φοβω

𝔏[h] places στ. 3 before 2, thus producing a strange sense (*numquam ambulauerat habens timorem*).

A similar case of transposition occurs in iv. 13–14, where *D* has:

επεγεινωσκον δε αυτους οτι συν τω ιη̄υ ησαν
τον ανθρωπον βλεποντες
συν αυτων (= -οις) εστωτα τον τεθεραπευμενον
ουδεν ειχον ποιησαι η αντιπειν

𝔏[h] puts στ. 1 after στ. 4, to the detriment of the sense.

(*c*) 𝔏[p]. In viii. 16 *D* has:

ουδεπω γαρ ην επι ουδενα αυτων
επιπεπτωκος

𝔏[p] omits στ. 2. This is a very singular case. To it I add a curious omission:

vii. 23 ως δε επληρουτο .μ̄. ετης αυτω χρονος
ανεβη επι την καρδιαν αυτου
επισκεψασθαι τους αδελφους αυτου

𝔏[p] omits στ. 2 (ὁμ.), thereby destroying the construction.

Also, a transposition in xii. 8, where *D* has:

ζωσαι και υποδησαι τα σανδαλια σου
εποιησεν δε ουτως
και λεγει αυτω περιβαλου το ιματιον σου
και ακολουθει μοι

𝔏[p] places στ. 2 after στ. 4.

(3) Syriac.

Some curious evidence is supplied by $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$. The most interesting cases are:

xix. 27. This passage has already been quoted (p. xxxiii). $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ gives 'et etiam ipsa dea totius Asiae et quam omnes gentes adorant spernetur'. In this version the words ἡ μεγαλειότης αὐτῆς ἥν, omitted by *D* in which two στίχοι are fused, do not appear. It seems to follow that this reading in $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ was inherited from a *gemellus* of *D*.

xx. 11–13. In *v.* 13 *D* has:

ουτως γαρ ην διατεταγμενος
ως μελλων αυτος πεζευειν

$\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ renders στ. 2 by *cum proficisceretur ipse per aridam*, but in *v.* 11 after οὕτως ἐξῆλθεν at the end of a στ. inserts *ut proficisceretur per aridam*. A writer appears to have looked forward from *v.* 11 to *v.* 13.

For other evidence which points to the same conclusion I refer to my discussion of $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$.

(4) Sahidic.

The most interesting piece of evidence is one which is mentioned by Ropes (p. cxliii, *n.* 2). In x. 33 *D* has:

εξαυτης ου[ν] επεμψα προς σε
παρακαλων ελθειν προς ημας

Here στ. 2 is supported by $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, but omitted by Γ, *cett.*

An old Sahidic MS. (*V*), cent. v, gives absurdly ἐξαυτῆς οὖν ἔπεμψα πρὸς ἡμᾶς (*med. om.*). Ropes says 'this is evidently a fragmentary survival from παρακαλῶν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ἡμᾶς which the "Western" text added to the sentence'.

For other evidence I refer to my article on this version. I will content myself here with quoting a single case, xi. 23, where *D* has:

και παρεκαλει παντας
τη προθεσει της καρδιας προσμενειν τω κ͞υ

𝔈 omits τῇ προθέσει τῆς καρδίας. The writer passed from line to line *med. om.*). The error was facilitated by ομ.

The evidence so far considered may be largely supplemented from patristic quotations. In order to indicate their character, I select a few examples from Irenaeus, the first author to quote largely from the Acts; e.g.:

iv. 11–12 και ουκ εστιν εν αλλω ουδενι
ου γαρ εστιν ετερον ονομα υπο τον ουρανον

Iren. has *et non est aliud nomen sub caelo* = καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἕτερον ὄνομα ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρ. Here he seems to have passed from ἐστιν in στ. 1 to ἐστιν in στ. 2.

vii. 2 αβρααμ οντι εν τη μεσοποταμια
πριν η κατοικησαι αυτον
εν χαραν και ειπεν προς αυτον

Iren. has *Abrahae et dixit ad eum* (*om. med.*). It is to be noticed that in *D* χαραν comes under αβρααμ and that the omission is assisted by ὁμ.

x. 5. 𝔏[d] (*def. D*) has:

et nunc mitte uiros in ioppen = και νυν πεμψον ανδρας εις ιοππην
et accersi simonem = και μεταπεμψαι σιμωνα

Iren. has *propter quod mitte ad simonem* (*om. med.*). The omission seems due to ὁμ.

xvii. 29 ουτε χρυσω η αργυρω
η λιθω χαραγματι τεχνης
η ενθυμησεως ανθρωπου
το θειον ειναι ομοιον

In the quotation of Iren. στ. 4 comes before στ. 1. The same order is found in 𝔈.

I abstain from multiplying instances, since patristic evidence requires to be treated with caution. This is particularly necessary in the case of omissions, since an author, after quoting a number of verses verbally, suddenly abbreviates for a while and then again quotes in full. It is needless here to give instances. I would only remark that in my opinion Blass is wrong in rejecting i. 17–20 (καὶ ἔλαχεν . . . ψαλμῶν) as omitted by Iren., who is merely abbreviating. In another passage, xv. 21, he brackets the verse (Μωσῆς . . . ἀναγιγνωσκόμενος) as omitted by Iren. As a matter of fact his quotation ends with *v.* 20. There is therefore no evidence to show that he omitted *v.* 21. Another instructive case occurs in v. 3–4, where Cyprian substitutes *cum esset fundus in tua potestate* for a long passage found in all MSS. (καὶ νοσφίσασθαι . . . τοῦτο).

§ 5. *Relation of D to its chief allies.*

Before going further it is necessary to say a few words about the respective merits of *D* and its two chief allies *c.Th.* and 𝔏[h]. The tendency of modern writers is to institute a *contentio dignitatis* between them and *D*, and to extol them at the expense of *D*. For myself I feel like the candidate who, when asked to distinguish between the major and minor prophets, replied, 'Far be it from me to make any invidious distinctions between those great and holy men!'.

It is indubitable that *D* has been subjected to a large number of what Scrivener calls 'violent alterations' in the shape of interpolation from the Γ text. These are naked and unashamed, for all to see. I will quote one instance only:

xviii. 19. και τω επιοντι σαββατω εκεινους κατελιπεν εκει

This is a combination of τῷ ἐπιόντι σαββάτῳ (*Z*) and κἀκείνους κατέλιπεν ἐκεῖ (Γ).

In several instances the same interpolation occurs both in *D* and *c. Th.*, e.g. i. 2.

Various cases in which *c. Th.* and 𝔏ʰ have suffered interpolation are discussed elsewhere. Such accidents were bound to happen in the course of transmission.

The most conspicuous service which is rendered to the text by *c. Th.*, 𝔏ʰ, and the other allies of *D*, is that they frequently provide extra matter which is not found in *D*, but bears the stamp of genuineness. Such passages are generally regarded as fundamental differences between *D* and the MSS. in which they occur. The observation that in nearly all cases the extra matter furnished by the allies of *D* occurs at the end of a στ. in *D* suggests that στίχοι have been omitted by accident or struck out by an abbreviator. If so, the various witnesses to the *Z* text serve to supplement each other's deficiencies. They are friends, not enemies. The evidence is scattered, but the text is homogeneous.

Whatever the defects of *D* may be, there are various reasons why it must remain the leading witness to the *Z* text, *viz.*:

(*a*) Whereas the readings of *c. Th.* are known only from marginalia, and only stray leaves of 𝔏ʰ are extant, *D* gives us a continuous text—apart from the lacuna from viii. 29 to x. 4—up to xxii. 29, where it comes to an end.

(*b*) In many cases *D* is our only Greek authority for a reading otherwise known exclusively from Latin or Syriac sources.

(*c*) *D* alone preserves the arrangement in στίχοι which appears to be at the back of all our authorities, and casts so much light on the transmission of the text.

It is upon (*c*) that I desire to lay most stress.

To these considerations I would add one other. It has been well said that 'the best MSS. are those which have been written by the most ignorant scribes'. Of this truth no better example is known to me than the ninth-century MS. of Cicero's *Philippics* known as *V*, which shows no trace of revision by the scholars of the Caroline Renaissance. The scribe was incredibly ignorant and capable of anything.[1] The MS. is full of patent errors, but it is in the errors of *V*, not in the smoother readings

[1] *Descent of MSS.*, pp. 169–71.

of the other MSS., that the truth is generally to be found. From this point of view the *fides* of *D* is undeniable. It is clear that it has passed through the hands of very ignorant persons. It exhibits all possible varieties of mechanical errors and corruptions. It has, however, the greatest merit which any MS. can have, that its faults are undisguised. It is a doubtful tribute to speak of any MS. as 'correct', since such 'correctness' generally implies revision due to a more or less intelligent critic.

§ 6. *Relation of Latin side* (𝔏ᵈ) *in cod. Bezae to Greek side* (*D*).

It is impossible to discuss the problem of *D* in the Acts without reference to certain controversial points, notably the relation of the Latin side (𝔏ᵈ) to the Greek (*D*). The proper place for such a discussion is not here, but later on in the article devoted to *D*. I venture, however, to state here very briefly some conclusions to which my analysis points. The facts will be given subsequently.

(*a*) 𝔏ᵈ is conspicuous among old-Latin translations of the N.T. for the unusual number of Graecisms which it contains. These are not evenly distributed. In Mt. and Mk., though frequent, they are as a rule not particularly striking in character, and may be paralleled from other MSS. In Jn. they are more frequent and sometimes abnormal. In Lk. and Acts they can only be described as amazing. In Lk. the Greek gen. abs. is continually translated by genitives instead of the abl. abs., or by a mixture of gen. and abl. I illustrate by a single instance:

xxi. 28 ερχομενων δε τουτων γεινεσθαι
incipientium autem horum fieri

In Acts the most striking Graecisms are the continual attempts to translate the Greek article, especially by *ipse* (23 exx.), the transliterations of Greek words, e.g. xiv. 8 *adynatus* (= ἀδύνατος), xvi. 37 *anetius* (= ἀναίτιος), and the retention of the Greek collocation of words, e.g. xi. 2:

ο μεν ουν πετρος δι ικανου χρονου
quidem ergo petrus per multo tempore

(*b*) 𝔏ᵈ is the work of several hands.

It can be shown by a number of tests that the translation of Acts stands apart from those of Evv. The *nomina sacra* are different, the vocabulary is different, the methods of translating Greek idioms are different. In Evv. a case can be made out, though not with certainty, for referring the translations of Jn. and Lk. to the same hand. Mt. and Mk., especially Mk., exhibit special features.

(*c*) 𝔏ᵈ is in the main a 'slavish' translation from *D*.

This, I need hardly say, is the view which has been generally held.

On the other hand it has been disputed by some distinguished scholars, who have maintained that $\mathfrak{L}^d$ is actually prior to *D*. It cannot be denied that in a certain number of cases *D* has been interpolated from $\mathfrak{L}^d$, but these are in my judgement rare. On the other hand there is a vast body of evidence. Apart from the Graecisms in $\mathfrak{L}^d$ already alluded to under (*a*), we find in $\mathfrak{L}^d$ numerous errors which had their origin in Greek, e.g. Acts xxi. 21:

> *μη περιτεμνειν αυτους τα τεκνα*
> *μητε εν τοις εθνεσιν αυτου περιπατειν*

Here *ἔθνεσιν* is an error for *ἔθεσιν*.

$\mathfrak{L}^d$ has: ne circumcidat filios
neque gentes eius ambulant

The same error occurs in xvi. 21 with similar consequences to $\mathfrak{L}^d$. Sometimes $\mathfrak{L}^d$ tries to make sense out of a corruption in *D*, e.g. Mk. xiv. 16:

> *και εξηλθον οι μαθηται αυτου*
> *και εξηλθον οι μαθηται αυτου*
> et abierunt discipuli eius
> et uenerunt discipuli eius

In *D* a *στ.* is repeated. $\mathfrak{L}^d$ disguises the error.

As a rule, however, the translator did not use any intelligence which he possessed, but followed *D* through thick and thin, regardless of the sense, as Scrivener says, 'in blind, helpless bewilderment'.

(*d*) In many cases where $\mathfrak{L}^d$ differs from *D*, the translator appears to have had beside him an old-Latin MS. which he used as an aid to translation. The consequence was that readings of this MS. were mixed up with his own literal translation from the Greek. It was noticed by Scrivener that important differences between *D* and $\mathfrak{L}^d$ are chiefly found in Mk. and Acts. It is precisely in the case of these documents that the use of an old-Latin MS. can be proved. In Mk. the translator employed a MS. similar to the Veronensis ($\mathfrak{L}^b$) or Corbeiensis ($\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$), with the result that the Latin vocabulary in this Gospel differs notably from that in the rest of Evv. In Acts the MS. used was similar to the Gigas ($\mathfrak{L}^g$). This the translator employed very freely, probably distrusting his own powers, with the result that the differences between *D* and $\mathfrak{L}^d$ are very frequent and that $\mathfrak{L}^d$ exhibits some astonishing mixtures of variants.

If these observations are sound, it follows that, except where *D* is illegible or mutilated, the value of $\mathfrak{L}^d$ is practically *nil*. Where it agrees with *D* it adds nothing to the evidence, where it agrees with other MSS. it has probably been interpolated, e.g. in Acts from $\mathfrak{L}^g$. When, however,

we have not the evidence of *D*, if 𝔏ᵈ has a reading which does not agree with Γ, the probability is that this was derived from *D*.

§ 7. *Methods of abbreviator.*

I now venture to make some remarks upon the methods pursued by the abbreviator who produced the shorter text (Γ).

(*a*) The first thing which any abbreviator would do would be to excise passages which he considered to be otiose. It is unnecessary to tabulate these here. I will content myself with a reference to Ropes (p. ccxxviii) who, writing from his point of view, says that the 'Western' text repeatedly has in excess, as compared with its rival, such phrases as διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: so vi. 8, ix. 17, 40, xiv. 10, xvi. 4, xviii. 4, 8. His contention is that such 'groups with a common character' betray the hand of an interpolator. It is equally simple to suppose that an abbreviator struck out such passages according to a system.

(*b*) Other excisions are less easy to understand, since the passages in question contain minute information, especially on topographical points. The most remarkable cases are:

xii. 10. και εξελθοντες κατεβησαν τους επτα βαθμους

D is supported by 𝔏ᵖ: Γ, *cett.* omit κατέβησαν . . . βαθμούς. Ropes says 'The seven steps of *D* seems to imply local knowledge not to be drawn from the *B*-text'.

xix. 9. το καθημεραν διαλεγομενος εν τη σχολη
τυραννιου τινος απο ωρας .ε̄. εως δεκατης

The words ἀπό . . . δεκάτης occur in δ, 𝔏ᵍ, *vg.*ᵃʷ, 𝔖ᵖʰ, as well as in *D*, but are omitted by Γ, *cett.*

ib. 28. και γενομενοι πληρεις θυμου
δραμοντες εις το αμφοδον εκραζον λεγοντες

The words δραμόντες . . . ἄμφοδον are supported by *c.Th.* δ, but omitted by Γ, *cett.* Ropes calls this 'one of the few intrinsically interesting "Western" additions'.

xx. 15. και μειναντες εν τρωγυλια

This στίχος is supported by δ, 𝔏ᵍ, 𝔖, 𝔈, but omitted by Γ. Ropes says that 'the words are probably genuine and fell out by accident at some very early stage of the text'. Either the στ. fell out or it was struck out by the abbreviator.

xxi. 16. και παραγενομενοι εις τινα κωμην

D is here supported by *c.Th.*, while Γ, *cett.* omit the στ. The distance from Caesarea to Jerusalem was 68 miles, so the mention of a halt in a village on the way is very apt.

Two other cases occur where *D* is not extant:

xxvii. 5. δι' ἡμερῶν δεκαπέντε 614, 𝔏^{h} *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖^{ph}: *om.* Γ, *cett.*

Ropes says 'unless the words . . . are regarded as genuine and accidentally omitted from the *B*-text, no explanation is at hand'. This is a very candid confession. I would point out that, on the analogy of i. 3 (τεσσεράκοντα δι' ἡμερῶν), the words would naturally form a στίχος.

xxviii. 16. ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης παρέδωκε τοὺς δεσμίους τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῃ δ, 𝔏^{gp}, vg^{aqw}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈: *om.* Γ, *cett.*

ib. ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς 614, 𝔏^{gp}, *vg*^{qw}, 𝔖^{ph}: *om.* Γ, *cett.*

I would here call attention to a very suggestive remark made by Ramsay on xxvii. 5. After saying that 'the addition obviously suits the occasion and may be unhesitatingly accepted as true, whether as written by Luke or as a well-informed gloss', he goes on to say, 'It perhaps dropped out of most MSS. *as wanting interest for later generations*'.[1] For this I would substitute that the abbreviator struck out these passages since he took no interest in such minutiae.

(*c*) In a number of cases the sense of Γ, *cett.* is obscure for want of information given by *D* and other witnesses. Defenders of the ordinary text assume that the obscurity was original and that the extra matter was invented to clear up the difficulty. I submit that this view is perverse. The difficulty is due to the excision. I take as a typical example xiv. 1–3. Ramsay says, 'According to the reading of the MSS.' (i.e. Γ, *cett.*) 'the narrative of these incidents is obscure; and it is hard to believe that the text is correct. In *v.* 1 the great success of the preaching is related, while in *v.* 2 the disaffected Jews rouse bitter feeling against the Apostles. Then in *v.* 3 we are astonished to read, as a sequel of the Jewish action, that the Apostles remained a long time preaching boldly and with marked success: and finally in *v.* 4 the consequences of the Jewish action are set forth.'[2]

These difficulties vanish in the longer form of *v.* 2, found in *D* and *c. Th.*, according to which, after the initial success of the Apostles, we are told in *v.* 2 that the ἀρχισυνάγωγοι and ἄρχοντες raised a persecution against the just, but that the Lord soon gave peace. Then *v.* 3 follows naturally.

Ramsay curiously remarks that 'the Bezan Text of 2, 3, is a good example of its character as a modernised and explanatory edition of an already archaic and obscure text. The discrepancy between *v.* 2 and *v.* 3 called for some remedy, which was found in the supposition that there were two tumults in Iconium: on this supposition *v.* 2 was interpreted of the first tumult and a conclusion "and the Lord soon gave peace" was tacked on to it.'

[1] *St. Paul* (1895), p. 318. [2] Ib., p. 107 sq.

With this I would compare xv. 33 sq. According to Γ, Judas and Silas, after spending some time in Antioch, are sent back πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστείλαντας αὐτούς, i.e. to Jerusalem. In *v.* 40 Paul, when starting from Antioch on a missionary journey, chose Silas to accompany him. This seems odd in view of *v.* 33.

The obscurity is cleared up by the reading of *D*, which after αὐτούς has:

εδοξε δε τω σειλεα επιμειναι αυτους (= -ου)
μονος δε ιουδας επορευθη

After this the statement in *v.* 40 is quite natural.

Ramsay's view is that στ. 1 is genuine and 'was at some time deliberately omitted from the text, from the mistaken idea that *v.* 33 declared the actual departure of Judas and Silas, whereas they had merely been told that they were free to go and Silas did not avail himself of the permission'. He looks on στ. 2 as a comment added by the 'Bezan reviser'.[1]

(*d*) In some cases an excision has produced nonsense. The most striking example is in xxiv. 7, where allies of *D* (*def. D*) have a long passage (καὶ κατά . . . πρός σε) relating to the rescue of Paul by Claudius Lysias, which is omitted by Γ. After this comes παρ' οὗ δυνήσῃ . . . ἐπιγνῶναι ὧν ἡμεῖς κατηγοροῦμεν αὐτοῦ. Ropes remarks 'the chief effect of the addition is to cause παρ' οὗ *v.* 8 to refer apparently to Lysias (cf. *v.* 22) instead of Paul'. He does not point out that no evidence could be so cogent as that of the Roman official who had made the arrest, while Paul would be a suspect witness when speaking about himself. If there could be any doubt between the two readings, it should be removed by *v.* 22, where Felix says ὅταν Λυσίας ὁ χιλίαρχος καταβῇ, διαγνώσομαι τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς. Blass drily remarks, *non ferri potest quod sec.* ℵ *etc. hoc monstrum oratoris post pauca verba iudicem ex reo cetera quaerere iubet.* It seems to me astonishing that any critic should ever have attempted to defend the reading of Γ here. It would be easy to add a number of examples, but I regard this case as *instar omnium.*

(*e*) Some excisions show a singular want of taste. The most remarkable case is in xi. 27, where *D* has:

κατηλθον απο ιεροσολυμων
προφηται εις αντιοχειαν
ην δε πολλη αγαλλιασις
συνεστραμμενων δε ημων
εφη εις εξ αυτων ονοματι αγαβος

Here στ. 3–4 are supported by $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, *vg.*^{qw}, and *Aug.*, while Γ, *cett.* omit them and botch by reading ἀναστὰς δέ for ἔφη in στ. 5.

The passage as given by *D* is one of the most interesting in Acts, since

[1] Ib., p. 175.

here for the first time the veil is lifted from the person of the writer, who includes himself with those present at Antioch. (In Γ, *cett.* the first use of ἡμεῖς occurs in xiv. 22.) Ropes says that 'the addition does not differ in character from the "Western" expansions in general, and it has in fact no greater claim than they to acceptance'. What manner of man would invent this personal detail?

The fact is that the abbreviator was not interested in details. He attached more value to speeches. This is why excisions are less frequent in the speeches, while they are very common in the accounts of St. Paul's journeys.

Instances have been already given (pp. xxii–iii) where picturesque details showing minute knowledge are replaced by a vague and spiritless abridgement in Γ, *cett.* On some occasions the abbreviator made long cuts, e.g. xvi. 35, where *D* has:

> ημερας δε γενομενης συνηλθον οις (= οι) στρατηγοι
> επι το αυτο εις την αγοραν
> και αναμνησθεντες
> τον σεισμον τον γεγονοτα εφοβηθησαν
> και απεστειλαν τους ραβδουχους λεγοντας
> απολυσον τους ανθρωπους εκεινους
> ους εχθες παρελαβες

In Γ, *cett.* this is boiled down into:

ἡμέρας δὲ γενομένης ἀπέστειλαν οἱ στρατηγοὶ τοὺς ῥαβδούχους λέγοντες· Ἀπόλυσον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκείνους.

It would require little ability to produce this colourless abstract. On the other hand who, starting from it, could produce the longer text with its wealth of detail?

(*f*) In a considerable number of cases there is a fundamental difference of conception between Γ and *Z*. I take, e.g., xviii. 26–7, where *D* has:

> εν δε τη εφεσω επιδημουντες
> τινες κορινθιοι και ακουσαντες αυτου
> παρεκαλουν διελθειν συν αυτοις
> εις την πατριδα αυτων
> συνκατανευσαντος δε αυτου
> οι εφεσιοι εγραψαν τοις εν κορινθω μαθηταις
> οπως αποδεξωνται τον ανδρα

In place of these seven στίχοι (which are supported by *c.Th.*) Γ, *cett.* have:

βουλομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ διελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Ἀχαΐαν προτρεψάμενοι οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἔγραψαν τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἀποδέξασθαι αὐτόν.

Here the journey of Apollos is ascribed to his own initiative, not to the request of the Corinthians in Ephesus.

A well-known case is to be found in xv. 1 sq. According to the purest form of the *Z* text (the evidence is complicated by interpolations) the Jews who had come from Jerusalem to Antioch go back to Jerusalem with Paul and Barnabas and lead the attack upon them there. In Γ, *cett.* nothing is said of their return and the opposition is ascribed to converted Pharisees in Jerusalem.

Other irreconcilable variants are, e.g., i. 2 ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ *Z*; ἄχρις ἧς ἡμέρας Γ: iv. 6 Ἰωνάθας *Z*; Ἰωάννης Γ: xiii. 33 τῷ πρώτῳ ψαλμῷ *Z*; ψαλμῷ . . . τῷ δευτέρῳ Γ: xv. 20 τοῦ πνικτοῦ Γ; *om. Z.* (cf. *v.* 29): xviii. 19 τῷ ἐπιόντι σαββάτῳ *Z*; κἀκείνους κατέλιπεν αὐτοῦ Γ.

It may be remarked that in the story of Sceva and his sons in xix. 14–16, and in the part assigned to Mnason in xxi. 16, there is a flat contradiction between the rival texts.

I would draw particular attention to a point of chronology where *D* is supported by Josephus.

xiii. 19–20 και καθελων εθνη επτα εν γη χανααμ
κατεκληρονομησεν την γην των αλλοφυλων
και εως ετεσι .υ̅. και .ν̅. εδωκεν κριτας
εως σαμουηλ του προφητου

Γ, *cett.* have in place of στ. 3–4:

ὡς ἔτεσι τετρακοσίοις καὶ πεντήκοντα· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἔδωκεν κριτὰς ἕως Σαμουὴλ προφήτου

According to Γ the 450 years refer to the period occupied in securing the land for the people. This does not agree with the usual chronology. According to *D* the period of the Judges lasted for 450 years. This agrees almost exactly with the reckoning of Josephus, *Ant.* v, according to which the period from the death of Moses to that of Eli consisted of 476 years. If we deduct from this total the 25 years during which Joshua was commander after the death of Moses, the result is 451.

It is to be noticed that Ropes, who approves the reading of *D*, says that the words μετὰ ταῦτα found in Γ, *cett.* 'were perhaps introduced *when the text of B was formed*'. This is a notable admission.

I have reserved until now a geographical variant which appears to me wholly decisive. This occurs in xx. 4, where all MSS., except *D* and 𝔏g, have:

Θεσσαλονικέων δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Σεκοῦνδος καὶ Γάϊος Δερβαῖος καὶ Τιμόθεος.

In ch. xix. 29 we have:

συναρπάσαντες Γάϊον καὶ Ἀρίσταρχον Μακεδόνας, συνεκδήμους Παύλου

It appears, therefore, that Gaius, who in ch. xix was said to be a Macedonian, like Aristarchus, has in ch. xx become an Asiatic, while Aristarchus remains a Macedonian. This is very odd.

The reading of *D*, 𝔏g differs from that of Γ, *cett.* in one particular only. Instead of Δερβαῖος *D* has δουβ||ριος, a letter after *β* having been erased. 𝔏d has *douerius*, while 𝔏g gives *doberius*. From this evidence it is generally assumed that the erased letter is -ε-.

Hilgenfeld, who frequently prints obvious corruptions which occur in *D*, (e.g. in xix. 29 καὶ συνεχύθη ὅλη ἡ πόλις αἰσχύνης) here gives Δουβέριος, but has no note to explain what he means by this. All other editors give Δερβαῖος, while Ramsay conjectures that Δουβέριος stands for Δύβριος, which he thinks may represent a local form for Δερβαῖος, not otherwise found.[1] Blass adopts an old conjecture, Δερβαῖος δὲ Τιμόθεος, and, as this conflicts with xvi. 1, he there explains ἐκεῖ as referring not to Lystra, but to Derbe.

It occurred to me that what is wanted here is the name of some place in Macedonia. I therefore thought it worth while to look at the index to Kiepert, where I found the entry 'Dobēres *pop. Mac.* (*Paeon.*)'. Further investigation showed that Herodotus (vii. 113) speaks of Δόβηρες as living near the Mons Pangaeus (i.e. midway between Philippi and Amphipolis), while Thucydides (ii. 98, 99, 100) mentions a town Δόβηρος in Paeonia. For further information I refer to my note.

It therefore appears that δουβ||ριος in *D* stands for Δοβήριος (or some similar adjective), in which case Gaius becomes a Macedonian again. If so, Blass's theory receives a *coup de grâce.* It is inconceivable that the author himself could make such a mistake as to mix up Δοβήριος and Δερβαῖος. The error in Γ betrays the hand of an ignorant successor.

I now call attention to xii. 25, where *D* has:

βαρναβας δε και σαυλος
απεστρεψεν (= -αν) απο ιερουσαλημ
πληρωσαντες την διακονιαν

Barnabas and Saul had been sent from Antioch to Jerusalem bringing alms to the Church. When their mission was accomplished they returned to Antioch, where they are found in ch. xiii. Here ℵ *B*, with various other authorities, give εἰς for ἀπό in στ. 2 (*A* has ἐξ). Westcott and Hort, who print this absurd reading, suggest that εἰς Ἰερ. should be taken, not with ἀπέστρεψαν (ὑπ-), but with πληρ. τὴν διακ., though they

[1] *Expositor* 1895, p. 224, *n.* 2.

admit that 'this is not a natural construction of the words'.[1] It is impossible to make sense out of εἰς. They could not return to Jerusalem, since they were already there.

Attention may now be drawn to certain cases in which the text of Γ seems to be corrupt.

iv. 25. Here there is great confusion in our authorities, owing to certain words or variants which are differently placed. The only collocation which is clearly absurd is that of Γ, which gives:

ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυεὶδ παιδός σου εἰπών

The position of *τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν* (i.e. David) is impossible, and *διά* is required before *στόματος*.

viii. 7. Γ here has an ungrammatical reading, viz.:

πολλοὶ γὰρ τῶν ἐχόντων πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα βοῶντα φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐξήρχοντο

Out of whom did the *πολλοί* go, and what is the construction of *βοῶντα*? A sense is yielded by *πολλοῖς* (*D*) or *πολλῶν* (δ).

xvi. 12. It seems clear that the correct reading here is *πρώτης μερίδος* as against *πρώτη τῆς* (*om.* *τῆς* *B*) *μερίδος* which is given by Γ and most other authorities. The allusion is to the four *μερίδες* of Macedonia under Roman rule. The reading of Γ can only mean 'first of *the* part', not 'first of *that* part', as rendered in the A.V. Though a number of scholars have made the correction by conjecture, the MS. evidence for it is excessively small, *viz.* one or two MSS. of the Vulgate which contain corrections drawn from a MS. resembling 𝔏p. For the reading of *D* here, *viz.* *κεφαλή* (so 𝔖vg) without *πρώτης* (or *πρώτη τῆς*) *μερ.*, I refer to my note on the passage.

Ib. 13. *BA* have *οὗ ἐνομίζομεν προσευχὴ εἶναι* without sense. ℵ has *οὗ ἐνόμιζεν προσευχὴν εἶναι*, of which Ropes remarks that *ἐνόμιζεν* is an error for *-ίζομεν* or *-ιζον*. *C* has *οὗ ἐνομίζομεν* (*-αμεν*) *προσευχὴν εἶναι*, which at any rate can be translated. *D* has *οὗ ἐδόκει προσευχὴ εἶναι*.

xix. 27. Here Ropes castigates with great severity what he terms 'the monstrous sentence of the *B*-text', *μέλλειν τε καὶ καθαιρεῖσθαι τῆς μεγαλειότητος αὐτῆς*, as opposed to *καὶ καθ. μέλλει ἡ μεγ. αὐτῆς* (*Z*). He adds, 'not only, however, is the *B*-text monstrous, but it has completely destroyed the highly effective rhetorical climax—one quite beyond the range of the "Western" glossator's usual power'. I should hesitate to express myself so strongly about this passage as compared with some others.

[1] Ropes says in defence of εἰς that 'at any rate this reading was adopted in carefully written MSS. for many centuries'. Copyists are a *servum pecus*.

Ib. 33. The absurdity of *συνεβίβασαν* ('instructed') Ἀλέξανδρον has already been mentioned (p. xxxviii).

xxv. 13. Here Γ*E* 614 have *κατήντησαν ἀσπασάμενοι τὸν Φῆστον*. This use of the aor. part. in a future sense is very strange,[1] and Blass reads *ἀσπασόμενοι* with 383, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖. Ropes says, 'The agreement of *B* ℵ *A minn. Antiochian* in support of the aorist is in itself strong proof that the latter does not make nonsense, although many modern critics have thought otherwise'. It is my experience that many *proprii errores* are widely diffused and die hard.

xxvi. 28. The reading of *B* ℵ with some other authorities, including *c. Th.*, is ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι. That there is some error here is acknowledged by Westcott and Hort. Ropes says that this reading, 'although difficult, yields an intelligible sense ("play the Christian") and must be accepted'. That ποιῶ Χριστιανόν can mean 'I play the Christian' is to me incredible. The reading of *A* πείθῃ = 'thou thinkest' (cf. οὐ πείθομαι in *v.* 26) gives a fair sense. The variant γενέσθαι (*E*δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖) for ποιῆσαι looks like a conjecture.

§ 8. *Transpositions in text of Acts.*

I conclude by drawing attention to certain cases where the text of Acts has been corrupted by transpositions which, as they pervade the MSS., seem to have been made at a very early date. Such errors are frequent in *D*, as will be shown subsequently, and arose easily in MSS. written in στίχοι. As the passages in question will be discussed in the notes, I shall here be as brief as possible.

x. 37–8. *D* here gives:

> υμεις οιδατε το γενομενον καθ ολης ιουδαιας
> αρξαμενος γαρ απο της γαλιλαιας
> μετα το βαπτισμα ο εκηρυξεν ιωανης
> ιη̄ν τον απο ναζαρεθ ον εχρισεν ο θ̄ς
> αγιω πν̄ι και δυναμει
> ουτος διηλθεν ευεργετων

It is obvious that there is some corruption here, since the accusative in στ. 4 comes between two nominatives, ἀρξάμενος in στ. 2 and οὗτος in στ. 6. The order is the same in Γ, *cett.*, though they differ in minutiae.

Sense is restored by putting στ. 2–3 ἀρξάμενος . . . Ἰωάννης after στ. 5.

[1] Cf. xx. 22, πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ συναντήσοντά μοι μὴ γινώσκων (εἰδώς) Here *DAE* and some minuscules have συναντήσαντα. As Ropes very properly remarks, -αντα 'though strangely persistent, is probably only a careless spelling for -οντα, which alone makes sense'.

Ἰησοῦν in στ. 4 comes naturally after οἴδατε τὸ γενόμενον κ.τ.λ. in στ. 1: also οὗτος in στ. 6. after ἀρξάμ.

xx. 10–13.

καταβας δε ο παυλος επεσεν επ αυτω
και συνπεριλαβων και ειπεν μη θορυβισθαι
η γαρ ψυχη αυτου εν αυτω εστιν
αναβας δέ και κλασας τον αρτον
και γευσαμενος εφ ικανον δε ομειλησας
αχρις αυγης ουτως εξηλθεν
ασπαζομενων δε αυτων
ἤγαγεν τον νεανισκον ζωντα
και παρεκληθησαν ου μετριως
ημεις δε κατελθοντες εις το πλοιον.

Apart from minor points of difference, Γ, *cett.* omit στ. 7, and in στ. 8 give ἤγαγον δέ for ἤγαγεν. The general order of the passage, however, is the same. According to all MSS. Eutychus is not restored to his friends until the departure of St. Paul. The reading of *D* makes St. Paul bring him back while the brethren are saying farewell, which seems almost comic: that of Γ, *cett.* refers to persons unnamed.

The key of the passage is to be found in the paraphrase of Cassiodorus in which στ. 8–9 (with ἤγαγεν) come after στ. 3. Paul, after restoring the young man to his friends, went up, broke bread, spoke until daylight, and departed. While the disciples were saying farewell, 'we' stepped into the boat. (In στ. 10 δέ is due to botching.)

ix. 12. καὶ εἶδεν ἄνδρα ἐν ὁράματι Ἀνανίαν ὀνόματι εἰσελθόντα καὶ ἐπιθέντα αὐτῷ χεῖρας ὅπως ἀναβλέψῃ Γ, *cett.* (*def. D*): *om.* 𝔏[h].

These words seem very inept in their present place. Why should Ananias be addressed as 'a man called Ananias' instead of in the second person? It may be remarked that εἶδεν does not mean 'hath seen', as generally translated, but 'saw'. The omission of the words by 𝔏[h] greatly improves the sense and was adopted by Blass. On the other hand the reference to a vision suits the character of St. Paul as portrayed in the Acts, and the sentence, though highly obscure, does not look like an interpolation.

It happens very frequently in MSS. that a passage is first omitted and subsequently brought back into the text in the wrong place. Has this happened here?

There is a place where the words would have an admirable sense, viz. after the end of *v.* 9 καὶ ἦν ἡμέρας τρεῖς μὴ βλέπων, καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲ ἔπιεν. After his vision on the way and three days of blindness without food or drink, the mention of a dream follows naturally. So he 'saw' in a dream a man called Ananias. We are then told 'now there was in

Damascus a disciple called Ananias and the Lord said unto him in a vision,' etc. The answer of Ananias then comes immediately after ἰδοὺ γὰρ προσεύχεται.

v. 36–7. In this notorious passage *D* has:

> *προ γαρ τουτων των ημερων*
> *ανεστη θευδας λεγων*
> *ειναι τινα μεγαν εαυτον*
> *ω και προσεκληθη αριθμος ανδρων*
> *ως τετρακοσιων*
> *ος διελυθη αυτος δι αυτου*
> *και παντες οσοι επιθοντο αυτω*
> *και εγενοντο εις ουθεν*
> *μετα τουτον ανεστη ιουδας ο γαλιλαιος*
> *εν ταις ημεραις της απογραφης*
> *και απεστησεν λαον πολυν οπισω αυτου*
> *κακεινος απωλετο και οσοι επιθοντο αυτω*
> *διεσκορπισθησαν*

Γ, *cett.* agree generally with *D*, but have some variants, the chief of which are that in στ. 3 they omit μέγαν, in στ. 6 have ἀνῃρέθη for διελύθη αὐτὸς δι' αὐτοῦ, and after στ. 7 add διελύθησαν. Also in στ. 11 πολύν is omitted by ℵ *B*.

Josephus refers on four occasions to the rising of Judas of Galilee 'in the year of the taxing' when Coponius was procurator under Quirinius governor of Syria. He puts this in the thirty-seventh year after the battle of Actium (=A.D. 6). He does not tell us what forces Judas had at his disposal or what his fate was. He is much more explicit about Theudas, whose rising is assigned to the procuratorship of Fadus (A.D. 44–5).[1] Theudas, he says, was a γόης who persuaded τὸν πλεῖστον ὄχλον to follow him with their goods to the river Jordan, claiming to be a prophet, and saying that he would divide the river by his command and give them a passage over it. Fadus, however, sent a troop of horsemen who, making a surprise attack, killed a number of them and took a number of prisoners, captured Theudas, cut off his head and sent it to Jerusalem.

It is impossible to doubt the truth of the story as told by Josephus, and it is not surprising that grave doubt has been cast on the historical value of Acts in consequence of so gross an error. I will not here discuss the various theories upon the subject, but will make some suggestions of my own.

In στ. 3 the statement εἶναί τινα μέγαν (*om.* μέγαν Γ) ἑαυτόν suggests a γόης or false prophet: we may compare viii. 9 λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτὸν

[1] *Ant.* xx. 97–8.

μέγαν of Simon Magus. The following στ. 4–6 do not suit Theudas, who clearly had more than 400 followers. Also, the statement in *D* ὃς διελύθη αὐτὸς δι' αὐτοῦ should mean that the person in question collapsed through his own incompetence, while Theudas was killed by the horsemen of Fadus. Judas, however, may have had a small force, and the silence of Josephus may mean that his revolt came to a speedy and inglorious end. On the other hand, στ. 11–13 with the words λαὸν πολύν (*om.* πολύν ℵ *B*) exactly fit Theudas, who according to Josephus led with him τὸν πλεῖστον ὄχλον.

I now call attention to the fact that the word ἀνέστη occurs twice. In στ. 2 it is followed by Θευδᾶς and in στ. 9 by 'Ιούδας. The names Θευδᾶς and 'Ιούδας are much alike. Have they changed places? If so, perfect agreement with Josephus is secured by a simple transposition: viz. for στ. 2–3 to read:

ανεστη ιουδας ο γαλιλαιος
εν ταις ημεραις της απογραφης

and for στ. 9–10 to read:

μετα τουτον ανεστη θευδας λεγων
ειναι τινα μεγαν εαυτον

The other στίχοι remain as they are. It may be added that στ. 1, which is somewhat harsh if it refers to events of A.D. 44–5, is very natural if it refers to events of A.D. 6.

§ 9. *Provenance of D.*

I now venture to offer a suggestion upon a subject of perennial interest, viz., the provenance of *D*.

Beza himself described it as *ex Graecia exportatum*, basing this opinion upon what he calls 'the barbarous notes of a Greek monk (καλόγηρως)' which it contains. Dr. Thomas Kipling, the first person to produce an edition of it (1793), hazarded the opinion that it was written in Egypt. Scrivener calls this a 'groundless notion' (p. xxix) and himself supposes that it was written in Gaul, somewhere in the region of Lyons, where it was found. His arguments were chiefly founded upon the 'debased Latin' of 𝔏ᵈ and show singular ignorance of late and vulgar Latin as well as conspicuous want of logic. Thus he says (p. xl), 'the preposition *de* is employed at least twice in the Acts as a substitute for the genitive: thus *de praecordia* (τῆς καρδίας) ii. 30: *de ecclesiam* (τῆς ἐκκλησίας) xx. 17 look more like French than Latin'. Why French, rather than any other Romance language? As a matter of fact, this use goes back to Plautus and is also found in Cato and Vitruvius.[1] It is frequent in inscriptions

[1] Löfstedt, *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, p. 105.

from all parts of the Empire, and is a familiar usage in old-Latin MSS. of N. T. In fact it pervades late Latin. He is equally unfortunate in his remarks upon the use of *habeo* as an auxiliary verb, of which he finds traces in Mk. xiv. 27, Acts i. 5. This he describes as 'a notable characteristic of the modern languages of Western Europe, *of the French as much as any*, as distinguished from the Latin, whence most of them sprung'. As a matter of fact this idiom is a notable feature in the style of Tertullian, who wrote in Africa. I have myself observed thirty-one examples in the two volumes of his works so far printed in the Vienna Corpus. It would be waste of time to multiply instances here. A modern reader who will take the pains to compare Scrivener's remarks upon vowel-changes, confusions of consonants, errors of accidence and syntax, &c. in 𝕷^{d} with the tables given by Diehl[1] from inscriptions found in various parts of the Empire will at once perceive the futility of such arguments.

The theory that *D* came into being in South Gaul is now given up. The *coup de grâce* was administered to it by the eminent liturgiologist, Dr. F. E. Brightman, who, after examining the lectionary notes in *D*, reported that they are Byzantine in character, and that there is no evidence for the use of the Byzantine system in S. Gaul. He also says, 'It remains to be proved that there existed in Gaul at any time the conditions to which the Byzantine lectionary of *D* could have any practical relations'.[2] He thought, however, that such conditions were present in S. Italy.

The theory that the home of *D* is to be sought in S. Italy has found advocates, but there are historical difficulties. S. Italy was largely Greek-speaking before the barbaric invasions and became so again in cent. viii–ix owing to the influx of Greek refugees from Constantinople. Between these two periods there is a gap, and it is in this gap that it is sought to place the origin and early use of *D*.[3] In view of this fact other regions of, or near, Italy have been suggested, viz., Sardinia (Souter), Sicily (Ropes), or somewhere in N. Italy (Sanday). All these writers seem unwilling to look eastwards.

I now refer to the views expressed by two distinguished palaeographers, Dr. E. A. Lowe[4] and Mgr. Mercati.[5]

Lowe's chief points were:

(1) *D* is a provincial product, i. e., it originated in a non-Italian centre.

[1] *Vulgärlateinische Inschriften*, 1910.
[2] *J. T. S.* ii (1900), pp. 446–54.
[3] Ropes, pp. xxxiii, *n.* 1, lxiv.
[4] *J. T. S.* xiv (1913), pp. 385–8.
[5] Ib. xv (1914), pp. 448–51.

(2) The scribe of the MS., as well as the early correctors, follows the traditions of a Greek scriptorium.

(3) From the time of its execution to about A.D. 800 the MS. lay in a centre (or centres) where Greek was the literary and ecclesiastical language.

(4) From about A.D. 800 the MS. lay in some Western or Latin-speaking centre.

Mercati's criticism was directed against (2). As against various pieces of evidence produced by Lowe, such as the use of Greek numerals to correct transpositions and to serve as quire-marks, he brought forward others which show agreements with the methods of Latin scribes, e.g., ornamentation, wording of colophons, abbreviations of titles by suspension (e.g. κατ μαθθ), and the position of the quire-marks. He also gave examples of Latin MSS. in which Greek numerals were used as quire-marks.

In view of these criticisms Lowe withdrew this part of his article. At a later date he said that 'to infer from this that *D* was written in a Latin centre, say in S. Italy, would be to ignore all the non-Latin features of the MS. Perhaps the truth lies elsewhere.'[1]

I now take the other points in Lowe's article.

Under (1) he calls attention to what he calls 'the *b–d* type of uncial' used in $\mathfrak{L}^d$, in which these letters are minuscule, while the remaining letters are uncial. He tells us that Italian scribes of cent. v–vi did not use this for a book-hand, but only in marginalia or at the end of a line to save space. In the provinces, however, it was employed as a book-hand, e.g. in Egypt, N. Africa, Asia, and Greece. Out of nearly 400 uncial MSS. known to him only two are written throughout in this *b–d* script, viz., *D* and the bilingual MS. of the Pauline Epistles known as D_2 (also at one time in the possession of Beza). This remark has not been called in question. The other points (3) and (4) are incontrovertible. Prof. Hunt, whom Lowe quotes in favour of his dating, has recently re-examined the marginalia at my request and maintains his previous opinion.

It is to be observed that Lowe and Mercati both speak of a *scriptorium*, either Greek or Latin, with fixed traditions and rules. It may be questioned whether this term is applicable, if *D* was produced in a place where neither language was indigenous.

I have long been of opinion that the home of *D* is to be sought not in the West but in the East. I was first led to this conclusion by the extra-

[1] Ib. xxv (1924), p. 271.

ordinary Graecisms found in parts of $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, especially in Lk. and Acts. Nothing parallel to these is to be found in any other old-Latin MS. of the N. T., or in any other translation from the Greek with which I am acquainted. They point to a locality where Greek was more familiar than Latin. On the other hand, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ makes a number of mistakes when rendering Greek words which a genuine Greek could not have made. The presumption, therefore, is that the translator[1] was neither a Latin nor a Greek, but some one whose Greek was not perfect and whose Latin was much worse.

My inclination, therefore, is to refer the origin of *D* and $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ to a country which was to a certain extent trilingual, i. e., where in addition to the native language Greek and Latin were also known, especially Greek.

It is well known that N. Africa was trilingual. Punic was the indigenous tongue, Latin was the official language, and a knowledge of Greek was common among the educated classes. The claims of Africa, however, cannot be seriously considered in view of the great number of Graecisms found in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, especially in Lk. and Acts. Also, apart from the work of one very early corrector (*G*), all the corrections and marginalia in *D* prior to *c.* A.D. 800 are on the Greek side, while the Latin side is neglected. This could not have happened if the MS. had been domiciled in a Latin-speaking country.

No such objection applies to Egypt or Palestine, in which a knowledge of Greek was widespread, while Latin was a subsidiary tongue.

In the remarks which follow I have to record general obligations to important articles by Heer,[2] Wilcken,[3] Schubart,[4] and Wessely,[5] to Sir Herbert Thompson's[6] edition of St. John (Sahidic), to Prof. Sanders's[7] edition of the Freer MS. of Evv. (*W*), and to Bludau's[8] recent edition of the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*. As the literature is large, I compress my remarks as much as possible. The chief points to consider are—

(1) The diffusion of Greek and Latin in the East.

(2) The purpose of bilingual MSS.

(1) Trilingual inscriptions occur at an early date. Thus we find in

[1] I use the singular for the sake of convenience. As previously set forth, I consider $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ to be the work of several translators.

[2] *Oriens Christianus*, ix (1912), *Neue Serie*, vol. ii.

[3] *Grundzüge der Papyruskunde*, vol. i (1912), pp. 54 ff., 136 ff.

[4] *Klio*, xiii (1913), pp. 27.

[5] *Wiener Studien*, xxiv (1902), pp. 99–151.

[6] *Gospel of St. John, according to earliest Coptic MS.* (1924).

[7] *New Test. MSS. in Freer Collection* (1918).

[8] *Studien zur Geschichte u. Kultur des Altertums*, xv (1927), 1–2 *Heft.*

Egypt the proclamation of Gallus issued in 13/12 B.C. in Egyptian, Latin, and Greek (*C.I.L.* iii, suppl. 14147^{5}), and in Palestine the trilingual inscription on the Cross (Lk. xxiii. 38, Jn. xix. 20).

For the use of three languages in Palestine by the people we may compare the words of Jerome, who, when describing the death of Paula in *Ep.* 108 (to Eustochium), says that a crowd of poor persons who gathered sang Psalms in Greek, Latin, and Aramaic. Elsewhere (*c. Rufin.*, ii. 22) he girds at Rufinus as being *bilinguis*, i. e., knowing Greek and Latin only, while he himself also knew Hebrew and so was *trilinguis*. He in his turn yields to Epiphanius, whom he calls πεντάγλωττος, since in addition to Hebrew, Greek, and a smattering of Latin (*ex parte et Latinam noverit*), he also knew Aramaic and Egyptian. A knowledge of languages was in especial request in places frequented by pilgrims. Thus an important passage in Aetheria, which will be quoted shortly, tells us that Greek, Aramaic, and Latin were used in the services at Jerusalem. A pilgrim from Bordeaux, speaking of Sinai, describes a monastery there: *in quo sunt tres abbates, scientes linguas, hoc est Latinas et Graecas, Syriacas et Aegyptiacas et Bessas, vel multi interpretes singularum linguarum.*[1]

The use of Latin in Egypt is treated exhaustively by Wilcken, and it will be sufficient here to make a few remarks. Under the early Empire Roman merchants, bankers, traders, and landowners settled in Egypt, principally in Alexandria, but also in the country. Romans were to be found at Oxyrhynchus in the reign of Claudius, as we know from a papyrus dated A.D. 48.[2] By the legislation of Caracalla (A.D. 212) the *civitas* was bestowed upon all natives of Egypt, except *peregrini dediticii.* Before the time of Diocletian's rule (A.D. 284–305) Latin had been mainly used in military circles, as is shown by the wholesale transliteration of military terms in the papyri. Diocletian himself uses Greek in a papyrus of A.D. 300,[3] but after his time the use of Latin was widely extended in official circles. In consequence instruction was given in Latin, as is shown by papyri in which passages from Greek authors are translated into Latin, or vice versa. We also have important papyri containing Latin texts, e. g., Oxy. 668 Epitome to Livy, cent. iii; 1097 Cicero, *pro lege Manilia, in Verrem* ii. 1; 1251 Cic. *pro Caelio* (parts of same papyrus, cent. v).

The Latin of the papyri varies greatly in character. Official documents are generally in good Latin; possibly the writers received assistance from officials. Some of the texts of Latin classics are written correctly, e. g. Oxy. 1097, 1251 (Cic.). Others are very illiterate. Thus in Oxy. 884,

[1] *Itinera Hierosolymitana*, Geyer (ed. Vind. xxxix), p. 184.
[2] *Oxy.* 255. [3] *Oxy.* 889.

cent. v, containing a fragment of Sallust, *Cat.* ch. vi, there are a number of errors, e.g. *coluerint* (= *coaluerint*), *vasa* (= *vaga*), *popularent* (= *propulerant*), *muegis* (= *magis*). A more singular case is to be found in Oxy. 668 (Epitome to Livy). Here the text is extraordinarily corrupt, especially in the case of proper names, e.g. *Bononia*] *rhodonia*: *M. Catone*] *lauatore*: *Aemilianum*] *mileanum*: *T. Manlius*] *uemilius*: *Dec. Brutum*] *decemuirum*. Of graver errors, such as *fictie grimonibus* (= *fictis criminibus*), *planus* (= *primus*), *pugnamentasi* (= *Pergamenos missi*), *trigem reddeterbuit* (? = *mittens deterruit*), the editors remark that 'the scribe understood little of what he was writing'. The most remarkable case is to be found in Amherst xxvi, cent. iii, containing a Graeco-Latin fragment of Babrius 16 and 11. The Greek is fairly correct, but the Latin is very illiterate.

λυκος δ ακουσας την τε γραυν αληθυε̣ι̣ν	luppus autem auditus anucellam uere dictu[m
νομισας εμεινεν ως ετοιμα δειπνησων	putatus mansit quasi parata cenaret
εως ο παις μεν εσπερας εκοιμηθη	dum puer quidem sero dormisset
αυτος δε πινων και χανων λυκος οντ̣ο̣ς	ipse porro esuriens et luppus enectus uẹṛ[e
απηλθε ψυχραις ελπισιν ενεδρευσας	rediuit frigiti⟨s⟩ spebus fastigiatur
λυκαινα δ αυτον η συνευνος ηρωτα	luppa eṇịṃ eum coniugalis interrogabat
πως ουδεν ηλθες αρας ως πριν ειωθεις	quomod[o n]ihil tulitus uenisti s[i]cut sole[bas
κακεινος ειπε[ν] πως γαρ ος γυναικι πιστευω	et ille [dix]ịt quomodo enim quis mulieri cṛ[edo
αλω[πε]κ εχθραν αμπελου τε και κηρ[ο]υ	bulpecula inionfortunam binearisq[ue h]ort[isque
[ξεν]η θελησας περιβαλε[ιν τις α]ικειη	peregrina uolens circomitti quis saeui[tia
[τη]ν κερκον αψας και λινου τ̣ι̣ [π]ρ[οσδησα]ς	codam su[c]census et linei quidem a[lli]gatus
αφηκε φευγειν την δ επισκοπος [δαιμ]ων	sinuit fugere hanc speculator genius malus
εις τας αρουρας του βαλοντος ωδηγε[ι	infra aruras missuro procedebat
το πυρ φερουσαν ην δε ληϊων ωρη	ignem babbandam erat autem tempus sectilis
και καλλεικαρπος ελπιδων πληρη[ς	et pulcheri fructus spaearum sorsus
ουδ ειδεν αυτον την αλωα δημητηρ	> oportet ergo serenae magis aut in- a equa irasci
[χρη πραον ειναι μηδ αμετρα θυμουσθαι]	†nec uidit eius ariis cereris
[εστιν τις οργης νεμεσις ην φυλαττοιμην]	est quidam ira ultricis quem custodiamus
[αυτοις βλαβην φερουσα τοις δυσοργητοις]	ịpsiṣmet ipsis nocentiam ferentes animosali[bus

Lines 17–19 in the Greek, which are not contained in the papyrus, are supplied from the printed texts to elucidate the Latin rendering. It is to be noticed that on the Latin side the translator originally omitted l. 16 of the Greek and then corrected his error by adding it after l. 17, with transposition symbols.

The ignorance of Latin shown by the translator is quite extraordinary. His most singular error is the use of a perf. pass. part. to render the Greek aorist active part., which occurs five times (l. 1 *auditus*, 2 *putatus*, 7 *tulitus* (!), 11 *succensus* . . . *alligatus*. The transliteration *aruras* in l. 13 is interesting. Some of the forms are very singular, e.g., l. 5 *fastigiatur* (? *praestigiatus*), 14 *babbandam* (? *baiulandam*), 19 *animosalibus* (= *animosis*).

This papyrus may be taken as a specimen of the lowest depths to which Egyptian Latin could sink.

I now come to (2), viz., the purpose served by bilingual MSS. of the Scriptures.

The answer which is generally given, and seems inevitable, is that they were intended for liturgical use. Thus Heer says:

> 'Es dürften allerdings die meisten dieser Bilinguen, wenn nicht alle, als liturgische Lesebücher gedient haben, da ihr so zahlreiches Auftreten erst aus dem Brauch der bilinguen Lesung verständlich wird'.

Greek was used as the ecclesiastical language throughout the early Church, in Rome and elsewhere. Thus in the Passion of Perpetua we are told that, when in her dream she beheld the bishop Optatus and the priest Aspasius, she addressed them Ἑλληνιστί.[1] As, however, many persons did not understand Greek, interpreters were necessary. Thus Epiphanius speaks of ἑρμηνευταὶ γλώσσης εἰς γλῶσσαν ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἀναγνώσεσιν ἢ ἐν ταῖς προσομιλίαις.[2] Here he speaks expressly of the lessons as being interpreted to a non-Greek audience. This may at first have been done orally, but it can hardly be doubted that in course of time bilingual MSS. would be used to lessen the strain placed on the interpreter. The most interesting passage dealing with this subject occurs in Aetheria's account[3] of the services at Jerusalem when it was crowded by pilgrims (ch. xlvii. 3–4).

[1] *Passio Perpetuae*, ch. xiii, εἴδομεν πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν Ὀπτάτον τὸν ἐπίσκοπον καὶ Ἀσπάσιον τὸν πρεσβύτερον . . . καὶ ἤρξατο ἡ Περπετούα Ἑλληνιστὶ μετ' αὐτῶν ὁμιλεῖν.

[2] *Migne*, xlii, p. 825.

[3] The date of Aetheria's pilgrimage is disputed. Most writers ascribe it to the end of cent. iv, but Meister, whose view is accepted by Löfstedt, assigns it to the middle of cent. vi. Bludau, the latest authority, who sets forth all the evidence very minutely, decides in favour of the earlier date.

'Et quoniam in ea provincia pars populi et Graece et Syriste novit, pars etiam alia per se Graece, aliqua autem pars tantum Syriste, itaque quoniam episcopus, licet Syriste noverit, tamen semper Graece loquitur et numquam Syriste: itaque ergo stat semper presbyter, qui episcopo Graece dicente Syriste interpretatur, ut omnes audiant quae exponuntur. Lectiones etiam, quaecumque in ecclesia leguntur, quia necesse est Graece legi, semper stat qui Syriste interpretatur propter populum ut semper discant. Sane quicumque hic Latini sunt, id est qui nec Syriste nec Graece noverunt, ne contristentur, et ipsis exponitur eis, quia sunt fratres et sorores Graecolatini qui Latine exponunt eis.'

Bludau says on this passage that in districts of Palestine where there was a mixed population, as in Jerusalem and Scythopolis, the words of the Greek liturgy were translated orally by interpreters. When I first read the passage, several years ago, it seemed to me to indicate the use of bilingual or trilingual MSS., and I am still of this opinion.

It is curious that Aetheria, who travelled widely in Asia Minor, Egypt, Arabia, and Mesopotamia, does not speak of a similar practice elsewhere, but only in Jerusalem. She is, however, a somewhat discursive writer, and her silence does not prove much. At one time I was inclined to place the habitat of *D* in Jerusalem itself.[1] I now prefer the claims of Egypt, which has provided us with so many bilingual MSS., not only Graeco-Latin, but also Graeco-Coptic, Graeco-Arabic, Syro-Arabic, Bohairic-Arabic. As Heer remarks, 'Similar causes produce similar results: it was the bilingual population which demanded bilingual literature, in Egypt as well as in Rome and elsewhere.'

The use of 'sense-lines', i. e., *κόμματα* and *κῶλα*, or *στίχοι* such as are found in *D*, appears in a number of Egyptian bilinguals. Heer goes so far as to say that 'the principle of colometry or arrangement in *στίχοι* was in the Gospels an ancient inheritance from Egypt, which in later times was imported into the West'. This remark appears to me very significant.

In connexion with this subject I take the case of what may be called the companion MS. to *D*, viz., D_2 (Claromontanus), cent. vi, containing the Pauline Epistles. This MS. is also a bilingual, and is written in *κόμματα* and *κῶλα*. Tischendorf in the Preface to his transcription of it says that 'the scribe was a good calligrapher who had a fair knowledge of Greek, but was ignorant of Latin, although being a skilful scribe he was not unwilling to copy Latin texts. On the Latin side there are countless

[1] It is somewhat curious that in Acts ii. 10 *καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες* 'Ρωμαῖοι $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ gives *qui hic demorantur Romani*. This rendering is peculiar to $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$: $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ and *vg.* have *advenae* for *ἐπιδημοῦντες*, while $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ has *peregrinantes*. The rendering of $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ would be natural if the translation was made at Jerusalem.

scribal errors, some of which are meaningless while others are nonsensical. Some of those which belong to the first class may have come from a more ancient exemplar, but such errors could not have been made by a Latin writer or by one who had even a moderate knowledge of Latin' (p. xviii). He has some interesting remarks about the correctors of D_2. He says that the first corrector was followed by a second who revised both Greek and Latin, then two or three who touched the Greek side only, then one who made a few corrections in both. Then a Latin writer revised the whole of Romans.

The solution which he offers is that the MS. was written in Alexandria. This he supports by what is probably a weak argument, viz., that the Greek is Alexandrian (i. e. the ordinary *κοινή*). He also thinks that the very thin parchment used is characteristic of Egypt. He supposes that the MS. was written '*ad Latinorum usum*' but was afterwards removed to some Greek monastery and some centuries later made its way to Latins in the West.

It is probable that some of Tischendorf's arguments require revision, but his main contention has not, so far as I know, been called in question. His remarks upon the faulty Latinity of D_2 are very interesting in view of similar phenomena in *D*.

The chief evidence for attributing *D* to Egypt appears to be that which is furnished by the Michigan papyrus on the one hand and the MS. of Thomas on the other. The papyrus shows us that a text nearly identical with that of *D* was found in Egypt at the beginning of cent. iv, while the quotations of Thomas show that a very similar MS. was in existence near Alexandria in cent. vii. It is therefore very tempting to suppose that *D* was written in Egypt in cent. v, though, in view of the wide diffusion of this text at an early period throughout the Roman world, other explanations are possible.

The evidence of the Michigan papyrus and *c.Th.* is supported by other papyri. For the Acts we have Oxy. 1597, cent. iii/iv, containing ch. xxvi. 7–8 and 20. Unfortunately this is very imperfect and the sections in question contain little in the way of variants. In *v.* 7, however, it has an indisputable agreement with 𝔏g in a striking variant against all other authorities. The editors remark: 'that a piece of the "Western" text of Acts should make its appearance in Egypt is an interesting circumstance, but perhaps not very surprising'. More conclusive evidence for Evv. is given by Oxy. 405,[1] cent. iii/iv, containing a fragment of Irenaeus (in Greek) in which his quotation from Matt. iii. 16–17 agrees in two variants with *D*, while the Latin version of Irenaeus has been altered to the reading of Γ.

[1] Cf. *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. iv, p. 264 (Appendix II).

In addition to this we have the facts of the Sahidic translation, which, though mixed in character, agrees with *D* in many well-known readings. In Acts these agreements are more frequent than in Evv., and it is interesting to observe that some which occur in the oldest MSS. have disappeared from those of later date.

Some special points may be mentioned which, though they do not prove Egyptian provenance for *D*, are at any rate consistent with it.

(1) Lowe's remarks upon the '*b–d* type of uncial' used in *D* have already been quoted, also his statement that the only other uncial MS. which employs this type is the bilingual MS. of the Pauline Epistles—which, as has been seen, is referred to Egypt by Tischendorf.

(2) It is to be observed that the order of Evv. in *D* and old-Latin MSS., viz. Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, is also found in the Freer MS. (*W*), cent. v, which, as Sir Herbert Thompson[1] points out, is the only Greek uncial MS. of Evv. which is positively known to be Egyptian. It may also be noticed that the position of the Catholic Epistles (i. e. before the Acts) which existed in *D* is that which they occupy in both the Sahidic and the Bohairic version.

(3) *D* consistently employs $\overline{\text{IHC}}$ and $\overline{\text{XPC}}$ as abbreviations for Ἰησοῦς and Χριστός, instead of $\overline{\text{IC}}$ and $\overline{\text{XC}}$, which are normal in Greek MSS. Since some writers have described $\overline{\text{IHC}}$ and $\overline{\text{XPC}}$ as Latinized forms, I would point out that they occur not infrequently in the papyri,[2] including the Michigan fragment, also sporadically in the Egyptian MS. *W*, and in the Sahidic and Bohairic versions. Sporadic cases also occur in ℵ and *B*, which are generally held to be Egyptian MSS. The evidence seems to indicate that $\overline{\text{IHC}}$ and $\overline{\text{XPC}}$ were prior to $\overline{\text{IC}}$ and $\overline{\text{XC}}$, and were therefore transliterated into Latin at an early date.

I venture to think that all this cumulative evidence points to Egypt as the birthplace of *D*.

[1] Op. cit., p. xxix.

[2] Rudberg, *Neutestamentlicher Text u. nomina sacra*, Uppsala (1914), p. 52.

ERRATA

(*a*) In text:

iii. 7	del. † before *αἱ βάσεις*
v. 15	*εἶχον*] *read* *εἶχεν*
vii. 27	*δικάστην*] *read* *δικαστὴν*
xiii. 20	*καὶ ἕως*] *read* *καὶ ὡς*
31	*πλειονας*] *read* *πλείονας*
xviii. 21	del. † before *τοῦ Θεοῦ*
24	*ὀνόνατι*] *read* *ὀνόματι*

(*b*) In app. crit.:

i. 2	*ἄχρις*] *read* *ἄχρι*
ii. 37	*ὑποδείξατε ἡμῖν* is also in *E*
vi. 4	*προσκαρτεροῦντες*] *c.Th.* has *προσκαρτεροῦμεν*
vii. 55	𝔏^{h}] *read* 𝔏^{p} (*ὁ δὲ . . . ἁγίῳ*)
ix. 20	𝔏^{p}] *read* 𝔏^{h} (*μετὰ . . . παρρησίας*)
xiii. 20	*καὶ ἕως D*] *read* *καὶ ὡς* (*ἕως*) *D*
xix. 14	*Σκεῦα*] *read* *Σκευᾶ*
xxi. 18	*ἦσαν δὲ παρ' αὐτῷ* (+*πάντες* 𝔖^{vg}) is the reading of *D*, 𝔖^{vg}
xxiii. 27	ac] *read* et
xxvi. 20	𝔏^{p}] *read* 𝔏^{h} (*ἐκήρυξα*)
xxvii. 11–12	cogitabant] *add* navigare

(*c*) In 'Witnesses' and Notes:

p. 189	Old-Latin MSS.] *read* old Latin MSS.
p. 253	iv. 38] *read* v. 38
p. 269	xiv. 13 *ἱερεῖ*] *read* xiv. 13 *ἱερεῖς*
p. 301	xxi. 8] *read* xxi. 18
p. 332	xiii. 46] *read* 46
p. 357	Garucci] *read* Garrucci
p. 362	Paulus] *read* Paullus
p. 374	Demitsa] *read* Demitsas
p. 384	White and Wordsworth] *read* Wordsworth and White

SIGLA

Codices Graeci

ℵ = cod. Sinaiticus, saec. iv
A = cod. Alexandrinus, saec. v
B = cod. Vaticanus, saec. iv
C = cod. Ephraemi, saec. v
D = cod. Bezae (pars Graeca), saec. v
pap. = papyrus Mich., saec. iv (ineunte, ut videtur)
pap. Oxy. 1597, saec. iii–iv
c.Th. = cod. Enatonensis, ex quo marginalia exscripsit Thomas Heracleensis A.D. 616
E = cod. Laudianus (pars Graeca), saec. vi
383 = cod. Oxon. (Clark. 9), saec. xiii
614 = cod. Mediolanensis, saec. xi
c.Ath. = cod. Athous, saec. x
Γ = codd. ℵ *ABC* consensus
δ = codd. 383, 614 consensus

Codices Latini

𝔏^{d} = cod. Bezae, pars Latina
𝔏^{e} = cod. Laudianus, pars Latina
𝔏^{g} = cod. Gigas, saec. xiii
𝔏^{h} = cod. Floriacensis, saec. vi
𝔏^{p} = cod. Perpinianus, saec. xiii
𝔏^{s} = cod. Vindobonensis, saec. vi
𝔏^{t} = cod. Toletanus, saec. xi
Aug.^{ab} = codd. Augustini

---

vg. = vulgata Hieronymi
vg.^{cl} = editio Clementina
vg.^{a} = cod. Ardmachanus, saec. ix
vg.^{q} = cod. Paris. 343, saec. xiii
vg.^{w} = cod. Wernigerodensis, saec. xv
vg.^{boh} = versio Bohemica
vg.^{prov} = versio Provincialis

Versiones Syriacae

𝔖^{vg} = Peshitto
𝔖^{ph} = Philoxeniana, A.D. 508
𝔖 = 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔖^{ph} consensus

Versio Sahidica

ℭ^{vt} = cod. Mus. Brit. Orient. 7594, A.D. *c.* 350
ℭ, ℭ^{vg} = versio vulgata

Scriptores

Amb. = Ambrosius, saec. iv
Ambst. = Ambrosiaster, saec. iv
Anon.^{c} = tractatus de prophetiis
Arm.^{cat} = catena Armeniaca
Athan. = Athanasius, saec. iv
Aug. = Augustinus, saec. iv–v
Cass. = Cassiodorus, saec. v–vi
Chr. = ps.-Chrysostomus, saec. iv–v (?)
Clem. = Clemens Alexandrinus, saec. ii–iii
const. Ap. = constitutiones Apostolicae, saec. iv (?)
Cypr. = Cyprianus, saec. iii
Did. = Didymus, saec. iv
Ephr. = Ephraemus, saec. iv
Epiph. = Epiphanius, saec. iv–v
Eus. = Eusebius, saec. iii–iv
Fil. = Filaster, saec. iv–v
Gaud. = Gaudentius, saec. iv–v
Hier. = Hieronymus, saec. iv–v
Hil. = Hilarius, saec. iv
Hipp. = Hippolytus, saec. ii–iii
Iren. = Irenaeus, saec. ii
Iustin. = Iustinus, saec. ii
Luc. = Lucifer, saec. iv
Orig. = Origenes, saec. iii
ps.-Orig. = tractatus de libris sacrarum scripturarum, saec. iv
Pac. = Pacianus, saec. iv
Perp. = Perpetua, saec. ii–iii
Petil. = Petilianus, saec. v
Polyc. = Polycarpus, saec. ii
Polycrat. = Polycrates, saec. ii

Prisc. = Priscillianus, saec. iv
prom. = tractatus de promissionibus, saec. v
reb. = tractatus de rebaptismate, saec. iii (?)
Sever. = Severianus, saec. v
spec. = speculum (ps.-Aug.)
Tert. = Tertullianus, saec. ii–iii
Vig. = Vigilius, saec. v

Editores

Bl. = Blass
Born. = Bornemann
Hilg. = Hilgenfeld
Scriv. = Scrivener
Tisch. = Tischendorf

NOTE TO THE READER

The use of the Bezan *στίχοι* (sense-lines), of blacker type, of angular brackets and asterisks is explained in the Preface, p. xi.

There are a few cases in which it has not been possible to reproduce the Bezan *στίχοι*. The chief of these are as follows:

i. 2 *D* has:

αχρι ης ημερας
ανελημφθη εντειλαμενος τοις αποστολοις
δια πν̄ς αγιου ους εξελεξατο και εκελευσεν
κηρυσσειν το ευαγγελιον

The arrangement here appears to have been disturbed owing to interpolation from Γ (cf. p. 336).

xiv. 5–6 *D*, which has been harmonized with Γ, has:

ως δε εγενετο ορμη των εθνων
και των ιουδαιων συν τοις αρχουσιν αυτων
υβρισαι και λιθοβολησαι αυτους
συνιδοντες και κατεφυγον
εις τας πολις της λυκαωνιας
εις λυστραν και δερβην

The *Z* reading, preserved by *c. Th. C*, 𝔏[h], has been arranged as far as possible on the model of the *στίχοι* in *D*.

ib. 19 The passage *καὶ διαλεγομένων . . . πάντα ψεύδονται*, preserved by *c. Th. C*, 𝔏[h], but omitted by *D* as well as by Γ, has been arranged in imaginary *στίχοι*.

xv. 5 The arrangement in *D*, which has been interpolated from Γ, is:

εξανεστησαν λεγοντες τινες
απο της ερεσεως των φαρισαιων
πεπιστευκοτες οτι δει περιτεμνειν αυτους

xvi. 38 *D*, which appears to combine variants, has:

απηγγειλαν δε αυτοισοι στρατηγοις
οι ραβδουχοι τα ρηματα ταυτα
τα ρηθεντα προς τους στρατηγους

In the text these three *στίχοι* are compressed into two.

xviii. 8 *D* gives:

ακουοντες επιστευον
και εβαπτιζοντο πιστευοντες τω θω̄

Here it is clear that variants have been combined.

In several cases *D* fuses two *στίχοι* into one after an omission, e.g. in xi. 26, where for

> συνεχυθησαν εν τη εκκλησια
> και εδιδαξαν οχλον ικανον

D[1] gives *συνεχυθησαν οχλον ικανον* (med. om.)

Similar cases occur in ii. 41, iii. 6, x. 27, xi. 26, xix. 27, xx. 4 (cf. pp. xxxiii, xxxv, xxxvii, xl, 182).

It may be convenient to the reader to have before him the exact reading of *D* in a few passages where there is a complication, though the line-division is not affected.

iii. 7–8
> αι βασεις και τα σφυρα και εξαλλομενος εστη
> και περιεπάτει χαιρομενος
> και εισηλθεν κ.τ.λ.

v. 28–9
> το αιμα του ανθρωπου εκεινου
> πειθαρχειν δε (= δει) θω̄ μαλλον η ανθρωποις
> ο δε πετρος ειπεν προς αυτους
> ο θ̄ς κ.τ.λ.

xvi. 39
> οτι εσται (= -τε) ανδρες δικαιοι
> και εξαγαγοντες
> παρεκαλεσαν αυτους λεγοντες
> εκ της πολεως κ.τ.λ.

xviii. 19
> καταντησας δε εις εφεσον
> και τω επιοντι σαββατω εκεινους κατελιπεν εκει
> αυτος δε εισελθων κ.τ.λ.

ibid. 21–2
> του θῡ θελοντος ανηχθη απο του εφεσου
> και κατελθων εις καισαριαν

Various cases of transposition are noted in the App. Crit.

ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

I

1 Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην
περὶ πάντων, ὦ Θεόφιλε,
ὧν ἤρξατο Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε
2 καὶ διδάσκειν, ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ
τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐξελέξατο διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου
καὶ ἐκέλευσεν
κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον·
3 οἷς καὶ παρέστησεν ἑαυτὸν ζῶντα
μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν αὐτὸν ἐν πολλοῖς τεκμηρίοις,
τεσσεράκοντα δι' ἡμερῶν
ὀπτανόμενος αὐτοῖς καὶ λέγων
τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ·
4 καὶ συναλιζόμενος **μετ' αὐτῶν**
παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων
μὴ χωρίζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ περιμένειν
τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρός,

1 Ἰησοῦς *DB* : ὁ Ἰησ. ℵ *AE* δ   2 ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ *Aug.*^{ab} *Vig.* (*cf.* Lk. vi. 13) : ἄχρις ἧς ἡμέρας *cett.* (*D*) *cf. v.* 22.   τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐξελέξατο διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου *Aug.*^{abc} *Vig.* : ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ πνεύμ. ἁγίου οὓς ἐξελέξ. ἀνελήμφθη Γ *E* δ, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph} : *leviter dissident cett.*, ἀνελήμφθη *ante* ἐντειλ. *hab. D c.Th.*, *om.* 𝔏^{gt} : οὓς ἐξελ. *ante* διά *hab. c. Th.*, *post* εὐαγγ. 𝔏^{gt}, 𝔈   καὶ ἐκέλευσεν *D c. Th.*, *Aug.*^{abc} *Vig.* ½ *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον *D c. Th.*, 𝔏^{gt} *vg.*^{a}, *Aug.*^{abc} *Vig. Ephr.* : *om. cett.* 3 οἷς καί] οἷς *Aug.*^{ab} τεκμηρίοις] + ἡμερῶν *Aug.*^{ab} (*ex lin. inf.*)   τεσσ. δι' (*om.* διά *D*^{1}) ἡμερῶν *D* : δι' (*om. Aug.*^{b}) ἡμ. τεσσ. *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Orig. Aug.*^{abc} : *om. Amb.*   4 καί] ὡς *Aug.*^{a} : ὡς καί *Aug.*^{bc} *Bl.*   συναλιζόμενος *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : συναλισκόμενος *D* : συναυλιζόμενος δ   μετ' αὐτῶν *D*, 𝔏^{gpt}, 𝔖, 𝔈 : αὐτοῖς *ACE* : *om.* ℵ B δ, *vg.*, *Eus.*   αὐτοῖς *om. ACE*   μὴ χωρίζεσθαι ἀπὸ Ἱερ. *Aug.*^{ab} ἤκουσα (audistis 𝔏^{d}) *D*   φησὶν (*om.* 𝔏^{d}) διὰ τοῦ στόματος *D*, 𝔏^{p2t2} *vg.*, *Aug.*^{abc} : *om. cett.*   5 ἐν (*om.* 𝔏^{dgt}) πνεύματι ἁγίῳ βαπτ. *D*, 𝔏^{gpt}, *Aug.*^{abc} : ἐν πνεύμ. βαπτ. ἁγίῳ ℵ *B* : βαπτ.

ἣν ἠκούσατε, **φησίν, διὰ τοῦ στόματός** μου,
5 ὅτι Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι,
ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ βαπτισθήσεσθε,
ὃ καὶ μέλλετε λαμβάνειν,
οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας,
ἕως τῆς πεντηκοστῆς.
6 οἱ μὲν οὖν συνελθόντες
ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες·
Κύριε, εἰ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ
ἀποκαθιστάνεις τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ Ἰσραήλ;
7 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς·
Οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστιν γνῶναι
χρόνους ἢ καιροὺς
οὓς ὁ Πατὴρ ἔθετο ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ,
8 ἀλλὰ λήμψεσθε δύναμιν
ἐπελθόντος τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς
καὶ ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες
ἔν τε Ἱερουσαλὴμ
καὶ πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ
καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.
9 καὶ ταῦτα εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ,
βλεπόντων αὐτῶν
νεφέλη ὑπέλαβεν αὐτόν,

ἐν (*om.* ἐν *vg.*) πνεύμ. ἁγίῳ *cett. Orig.* ὃ καὶ (καὶ ὃ *D*) μέλλετε λαμβάνειν *D*, 𝔏[gt], *Aug.*[abc] (*etiam Ep.* 265. 3, *Serm.* 71) *Ambst. Hil. Vig. Ephr. Cass.*: *om. cett. Orig. Gaud.* ἕως (ἀλλ᾽ ἕως 𝔈, *Ephr.*) τῆς πεντηκοστῆς *D*, 𝔈, *Aug.*[ab] (+ 2/2), *Cass. Ephr.*: *om. cett.* 6 ἐπηρώτων *DE* δ: ἠρώτων Γ ἀποκαθιστάνεις] ἀποκαταστάνεις εις *D* (*cf.* xvii. 15): repraesentaberis et quando *Aug.*[a] 7 καὶ εἶπεν *D*, 𝔏[gpt]: εἶπεν *B*: ὁ δὲ εἶπεν *C*, *Aug.*[ab]: εἶπεν δέ א *A* δ: ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν *E*, *Aug.*[c] πρὸς αὐτούς *om. Aug.*[ab] οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστιν] nemo potest *Cypr. Aug.*[ab] (*cf. Epp.* 198. 2, 199. 4) 8 ἐπελθόντος] ἐπέλθουσαν 𝔏[t], *Aug.*[abc] (*et saepius*) μου *D* Γ: μοι *E* δ, 𝔏[gpt], *Aug.*[abc] (*et saepius*) *alii* ἔν τε Ἱερουσαλήμ *om. prom.* πάσῃ *DAC*, *Orig. Hil.*: ἐν πάσῃ *cett. Aug.*[abc] *alii* 9 καὶ ταῦτα] ταῦτα *Aug.*[bc] εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ *D*: εἰπών (εἰπόντων א) Γ *E* δ βλεπόντων αὐτῶν *om. D*, 𝔈, *Aug.*[b] *et Ep.* 199. 41 νεφέλη ὑπέλαβεν (-έβαλεν *D*) αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπήρθη *D*, 𝔖[vg], 𝔈, *Aug.*[b] *et Ep.* 199: ἐπήρθη καὶ νεφέλη ὑπέλαβεν αὐτόν *cett. Eus. Aug.*[c] *Cass.*

καὶ ἀπήρθη ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν.
10 *καὶ ὡς ἀτενίζοντες ἦσαν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν*
πορευομένου αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο παρειστήκεισαν αὐτοῖς
11 *ἐν ἐσθῆτι λευκῇ· οἳ καὶ εἶπαν·*
Ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι, *τί ἑστήκατε*
ἐμβλέποντες εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν ;
οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ *ἀναλημφθεὶς ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν*
εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν
οὕτως *ἐλεύσεται*
ὃν *τρόπον ἐθεάσασθε αὐτὸν πορευόμενον*
εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.
12 *τότε ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς* Ἰερουσαλὴμ
ἀπὸ ὄρους τοῦ καλουμένου Ἐλαιῶνος,
ὅ *ἐστιν ἐγγὺς* Ἰερουσαλὴμ
σαββάτου ἔχον ὁδόν.
13 *καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθον, ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὑπερῷον*
οὗ *ἦσαν καταμένοντες*
ὅ *τε* Πέτρος *καὶ* Ἰωάννης,
Ἰάκωβος *καὶ* Ἀνδρέας,
Φίλιππος *καὶ* Θωμᾶς,
Βαρθολομαῖος *καὶ* Μαθθαῖος,
Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου,

9 ἀπὸ τῶν (*om.* τῶν *D*) ὀφθ. αὐτῶν *cett.* : ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν 𝔈, *Aug.*^{b} *et Ep.* 199 : ἀπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν *prom.* 10 καὶ ἰδού] ἰδού 𝔏^{gt} *vg.*, 𝔈, *Aug.*^{bc} : *om. prom.* δύο ἄνδρες 614, 𝔏^{gt} *vg.*, *Aug.*^{bc}, *prom.* ἐσθῆτι λευκῇ *DE* δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *Aug.*^{bc} : ἐσθήσεσι λευκαῖς Γ, 𝔏^{pt} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Eus.*, *prom.* 11 εἶπαν] + πρὸς αὐτούς *Aug.*^{b} ἐμβλέποντες *DAC* 614 : βλέποντες ℵ *BE* 383 : stupentes *Hier.* εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (*post* ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν) *cett. Eus. Aug.*^{bc} *Hier. Fil.* : *om. D*, 𝔏^{gt}, *Aug.* (*saep.*) *Vig.*, *prom.* 12 ἄπεχον *Bl.* 13 ἀνέβησαν *ante* εἰς τό *hab. cett. Aug.*^{bc}, *post* ὑπερῷον *ABC*, *om.* ℵ οὗ] + τότε 𝔏^{gp} ὅ τε Πέτρος καὶ Ἀνδρέας καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης *E* : ὅ τε Πετρ. καὶ Ἰάκ. καὶ Ἰωάνν. καὶ Ἀνδρ. δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* ὁ τοῦ *D*, 𝔖^{ph} : ὁ *Chr.* : *om.* Γ *E* δ Σίμων *D* : καὶ Σίμων *cett. Aug.*^{bc}. Ἰακώβου] ὁ τοῦ Ἰακ. 𝔖^{ph} 14 οὗτοι πάντες (*om.* πάντες 𝔏^{g}) ἦσαν προσκαρτ. *cett.* : καὶ ἦσαν προσκαρτ. πάντες *Cypr. Aug.*^{b} τῇ προσευχῇ] ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς *Aug.*^{b} : τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ δεήσει δ, *Fil. Chr.* : τῇ δεήσει καὶ τῇ προσεύχῃ *Orig.* ταῖς *D*, *Chr.* : *om.* Γ *E* δ γυναιξίν *cett. Cypr. Aug.*^{bc} : + καὶ τέκνοις *D* (*cf.* xxi. 5) τῇ

Σίμων ὁ ζηλωτὴς καὶ Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου.
14 οὗτοι πάντες ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες
ὁμοθυμαδὸν τῇ προσευχῇ
σὺν ταῖς γυναιξὶν
καὶ Μαρίᾳ τῇ μητρὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ
καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ.
15 ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἀναστὰς ὁ Πέτρος
ἐν μέσῳ τῶν μαθητῶν εἶπεν·
ἦν γὰρ ὁ ὄχλος ὀνομάτων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὡς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι·
16 Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, δεῖ πληρωθῆναι
τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην ἣν προεῖπεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον
διὰ στόματος Δαυὶδ περὶ Ἰούδα
τοῦ γενομένου ὁδηγοῦ
τοῖς συλλαβοῦσιν τὸν Ἰησοῦν.
17 ὅτι κατηριθμημένος ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν,
ὃς ἔλαχεν τὸν κλῆρον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης.
18 οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐκτήσατο χωρίον ἐκ μισθοῦ
τῆς ἀδικίας αὐτοῦ,
⟨**καὶ τὸν τράχηλον κατέδησεν αὐτοῦ**⟩,
καὶ πρηνὴς γενόμενος ἐλάκησεν μέσος,
καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ·
19 ὃ καὶ γνωστὸν ἐγένετο πᾶσιν
τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Ἱερουσαλήμ,

μητρί] μητρί *D* : quae fuerat (fuit, erat) mater 𝔏^{gp}, *Cypr. Aug.*^{b} τοῖς *cett. Cypr. Aug.*^{bc} : σὺν τοῖς *BE* δ, 𝔖 15 ἐν δέ *D c.Th. E*, 𝔏^{p2}, *Aug.*^{c} : ἐν 𝔏^{dpt} *vg.* : καὶ ἐν *cett. Aug.*^{b} ὁ *D* : *om.* Γ *E* δ μαθητῶν *cett. Cypr. Aug.*^{bc} : ἀδελφῶν Γ, *vg.*, 𝔈, *Cass.* γάρ (praeterea 𝔏^{d}) *D* : τε ℵ *ABE* δ : δέ *cett. Cypr. Aug.*^{bc} ὀνομάτων] ἀνδρῶν *E*, 𝔏^{gpt} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug.*^{bc} : *om. Cypr.* ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό *om.* 𝔏^{dgp}, *Aug.*^{c}, 𝔖^{vg} 16 δεῖ *D*, 𝔏^{gpt} *vg.*, *Iren. Aug.*^{b} *Vig.* : ἔδει *cett. Orig. Eus. Hier.* ταύτην *cett. Iren. Aug.*^{b} : *om.* Γ, *vg.*, 𝔈, *Orig. Eus. Hier. Vig.* τόν *DE* δ : *om.* Γ, *Eus.* 17 ὅτι *cett. Iren. Eus. Aug.*^{b} : ὅς 𝔏^{dgt} ἐν] σύν δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* ὅς *D*, *Aug.*^{b} : καί *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Eus.* (ὃς ἔλαχεν . . . βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν *v.* 20 *om. Iren. abbrevians, secl. Bl.*) 18 αὐτοῦ *D*, 𝔏^{t}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Eus. Aug.*^{b} : *om. cett.* καὶ τὸν τράχηλον κατέδησεν αὐτοῦ *Aug.*^{b} : *om. cett.* (*D*), *cf. Ephr. ad Diatess.* (p. 240 *Mösinger*), *const. Ap.* vii. 2. 4 πρήνης γενόμενος] suspensus *vg.* 19 ὃ καί *D*, *Aug.*^{b} : quod 𝔏^{t} : καὶ ὅ ℵ : καί *ABCE* δ, 𝔏^{dp} *vg.* : itaque 𝔏^{g}

ὥστε κληθῆναι τὸ χωρίον ἐκεῖνο
τῇ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν Ἀκελδαμάχ,
τοῦτ' ἔστιν χωρίον αἵματος.
20 γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν·
Γενηθήτω ἡ ἔπαυλις αὐτοῦ ἔρημος
καὶ μὴ ἔστω ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ
καὶ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λαβέτω ἕτερος.
21 δεῖ οὖν τῶν συνελθόντων ἡμῖν ἀνδρῶν
ἐν παντὶ τῷ χρόνῳ
ᾧ εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ἐξῆλθεν
22 ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς **Χριστὸς**, ἀρξάμενος
ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος Ἰωάννου
ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς ἀνελήμφθη
ἀφ' ἡμῶν, μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ
σὺν ἡμῖν γενέσθαι ἕνα τούτων.
23 καὶ ἔστησεν δύο, Ἰωσὴφ
τὸν καλούμενον Βαρσαββᾶν,
ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰοῦστος, καὶ Μαθθίαν,
24 καὶ προσευξάμενοι εἶπαν·
Σὺ Κύριε καρδιογνῶστα πάντων,
ἀνάδειξον ὃν ἐξελέξω ἐκ τούτων τῶν δύο
25 ἕνα, λαβεῖν τὸν τόπον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης

19 διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν *cett. Aug.*$^{\mathrm{b}}$: ἰδίᾳ διαλ. αὐτῶν (αὐτῶν διαλ. *E*) *ACE* δ, *Eus.* Ἀκελδαμά *C* δ, *vg.*, 𝔖, *Ephr.* 20 ἡ *om. D* αὐτοῦ *cett. Iren. Aug.*$^{\mathrm{b}}$: αὐτῶν 𝔏$^{\mathrm{dt}}$ *vg.* καὶ μὴ ἔστω (ᾖ *D*) ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ *cett.* : καὶ ἐν τοῖς σκηνώμασιν αὐτῶν μὴ ἔστω ὁ κατοικῶν 𝔈 (LXX) : *om. Hil.* λαβέτω] λάβοι *E*, *Orig.*, *const. Ap.* (LXX) : λάβῃ 614 21 τῷ *D* : *om.* Γ *E* δ ᾧ Γ, *vg.*, *Aug.*$^{\mathrm{b}}$: ἐν ᾧ *E* δ, 𝔏$^{\mathrm{gp}}$: ὡς *D* (*cf.* v. 15, xxi. 19) ἐφ' ἡμᾶς *post* εἰσῆλθεν *hab. Aug.*$^{\mathrm{b}}$ Χριστός *D*, 𝔖$^{\mathrm{ph}}$, *Aug.*$^{\mathrm{b}}$: *om. cett.* 22 γενέσθαι σὺν ἡμῖν *E* δ, 𝔏$^{\mathrm{g}}$, 𝔖 23 καί] + τούτων λεχθέντων *E* ἔστησεν *D*, 𝔏$^{\mathrm{g}}$, *Aug.*$^{\mathrm{b}}$: ἔστησαν *cett. Eus.* Ἰωσήφ] Ἰωσῆν 𝔖$^{\mathrm{ph}}$, 𝔈 Βαρσαββᾶν *cett. Eus. Aug.*$^{\mathrm{b}}$: Βαρνάβαν *D*, 𝔏$^{\mathrm{gpt}}$ *vg.*$^{\mathrm{aw}}$, *Orig.*$^{\mathrm{lat}}$ ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰοῦστος] τὸν καὶ Ἰοῦστον *Aug.*$^{\mathrm{b}}$ *Bl.* 24 καὶ προσευξάμενος εἶπεν *Aug.*$^{\mathrm{b}}$ 25 ἕνα λαβεῖν *cett.* (𝔏$^{\mathrm{d}}$) : ἀναλαβεῖν *D*, *Aug.*$^{\mathrm{b}}$ τὸν τόπον (τόπον τόν *D*) *cett.* (*c. Th.*), *Aug.*$^{\mathrm{b}}$ *Ephr.* : τὸν κλῆρον ℵ *E* δ, 𝔖 ἀφ' ἧς] ἐξ ἧς *E* δ, *Chr.* 26 αὐτῶν *cett. Aug.*$^{\mathrm{b}}$: αὐτοῖς Γ, *vg.*, 𝔈 : *om.* 614, 𝔖$^{\mathrm{vg}}$ ὁ *om. D* δώδεκα *D*, 𝔖$^{\mathrm{ph}}$, *Eus.* : δωδέκατος *Cass.* : ἕνδεκα δωδέκατος *Aug.*$^{\mathrm{b}}$ *Arm.*$^{\mathrm{cat}}$ (*Dion. Areop.*) : ἕνδεκα *cett. Orig.*$^{\mathrm{lat}}$: *de loco disputat Aug. Cons. Ev.* iii. 71 : *cf.*

καὶ ἀποστολῆς,
ἀφ' ἧς παρέβη Ἰούδας
πορευθῆναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον.
26 *καὶ ἔδωκαν κλήρους αὐτῶν*
καὶ ἔπεσεν ὁ κλῆρος ἐπὶ Μαθθίαν,
καὶ συγκατεψηφίσθη μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων.

II

1 **καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις**
τοῦ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν
τῆς πεντηκοστῆς,
ὄντων αὐτῶν πάντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό,
2 *καὶ* **ἰδοὺ** *ἐγένετο ἄφνω ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἦχος,*
ὥσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας,
καὶ ἐπλήρωσεν πάντα τὸν οἶκον
οὗ ἦσαν καθεζόμενοι.
3 *καὶ ὤφθησαν αὐτοῖς διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι*
ὡσεὶ πυρός, ἐκάθισέν τε
ἐφ' ἕνα ἕκαστον αὐτῶν.
4 *καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες Πνεύματος Ἁγίου,*
καὶ ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις,
καθὼς τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐδίδου ἀποφθέγγεσθαι αὐτοῖς.

ad Ioh. xxvii. 6, 10; xlix. 11, 8 II 1 *καὶ ἐγένετο . . . ἐκείναις D*: in temporibus illis 𝕷^{t}: in illo tempore *Aug.*^{a}: *om. cett. Aug.*^{c} τοῦ *D*: καὶ ἐν τῷ *cett.* (et cum 𝕷^{d}) τὰς ἡμέρας 𝕷^{deg} *vg.*, 𝕾^{vg}, *Aug.*^{c} *Cass.* ὄντων αὐτῶν πάντων *D*, 𝕾^{vg}: ἦσαν πάντες (*om.* πάντες ℵ) ὁμοῦ Γ, 𝕷^{d}, *Aug.*^{bc} *Vig.*: ἦσαν πάντες (*om.* πάντες *E*) ὁμοθυμαδόν (+ ὁμοῦ *Aug.*^{a}, *prom.*) *E* 383, *Aug.*^{a}: ἦσαν ἅπαντες οἱ ἀπόστολοι ὁμοθυμαδόν 614 2 ἰδού *D*, *Cyril.*: *om. cett.* (𝕷^{d}), *Cypr. Eus. Aug.*^{abc} *Vig.* πνοῆς βιαίας *cett.* (𝕷^{d}): βιαίας πνοῆς *D* 383 καὶ ἐπλήρωσεν . . . καθεζόμενοι *cett. Aug.*^{abc}: *om. Aug. saepius* πάντα *D*, 𝕷^{ep}: ὅλον *cett. Aug.*^{abc}: *om. Hier.* οἶκον] τόπον 𝕾^{vg}, *Cypr. Aug.*^{a}, *prom.* καθεζόμενοι *DC*: καθήμενοι ℵ *ABE* δ 3 ἐκάθισέν τε (δέ *C*, 𝕷^{e}, *Aug.*^{c} *Petil.*) *ACE* δ, *Eus. Aug.*^{abc} (*et semper*) *Vig. Ephr. multi alii*: καὶ ἐκάθισεν *B*, 𝕷^{d}: καὶ ἐκάθισαν (+ τε *D*) *D* ℵ, 𝕾, 𝕰 4 καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν . . . Ἁγίου *cett. Aug.*^{abc} *Petil.*: *om. Aug.* $\frac{5}{7}$, *prom.* ἅπαντες *C* 614, *Chr.* ἑτέραις] *variis* 𝕾^{vg}, *Aug.*^{bc} *Petil.*: *om. Aug.*^{a} (*et saep.*) τὸ πνεῦμα] + τὸ ἅγιον *E*, 𝕷^{g} *vg.*, *Hier.* αὐτοῖς ἀποφθέγγεσθαι *E* δ, *Aug.*^{ab}, 𝕾

5 *ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἦσαν κατοικοῦντες*
ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους
τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν.
6 *γενομένης δὲ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης*
συνῆλθεν τὸ πλῆθος καὶ συνεχύθη,
ὅτι ἤκουον εἷς ἕκαστος
λαλοῦντας ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν.
7 *ἐξίσταντο δὲ καὶ ἐθαύμαζον*
λέγοντες **πρὸς ἀλλήλους·**
Οὐκ ἰδοὺ ἅπαντες οὗτοί εἰσιν
οἱ λαλοῦντες Γαλιλαῖοι;
8 *καὶ πῶς ἡμεῖς ἀκούομεν*
ἕκαστος τὴν διάλεκτον ἡμῶν
ἐν ᾗ ἐγεννήθημεν;
9 *Πάρθοι καὶ Μῆδοι καὶ Ἐλαμῖται,*
καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν,
Ἰουδαίαν τε καὶ Καππαδοκίαν,
10 *Πόντον καὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν, Φρυγίαν τε*
καὶ Παμφυλίαν, Αἴγυπτον
καὶ τὰ μέρη τῆς Λιβύης

5 ἐν (+δέ *Aug.*^{ab}) Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἦσαν *D*, *Aug.*^{ab}: ἦσαν δὲ ἐν (εἰς ℵ *A*) Ἱερ. *cett.* *Aug.*^{c} *alii* κατοικοῦντες ℵ, *Bl.*: +Ἰουδαῖοι (*post* ἄνδρες *C*) *cett.* (*D*) εὐλαβεῖς *ante* ἄνδρες *hab.* *D* : *om.* *Aug.*^{ab} : ἄνδρες καὶ εὐλαβεῖς *Aug.*^{c} 6 ταύτης *om.* *Aug.*^{ab} ὅτι *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): καί *D* ἤκουον *DAE* δ, 𝔏^{p} : ἤκουεν (-ουσεν ℵ *B*) *cett.* *Aug.*^{abc} εἷς *om.* ℵ *E* λαλοῦντας ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν (lingua sua 𝔏^{d}, 𝔈) *D* *c.Th.*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ λαλούντων αὐτῶν *cett.* *Aug.*^{c} : suo sermone et suis linguis loquentes *Aug.*^{ab} 7 δέ *DB* δ, 𝔏^{g}, *Aug.*^{abc} : +ἅπαντες (πάντες *ACE*) *cett.* πρὸς ἀλλήλους *cett.* *Aug.*^{abc} : *om.* Γ 383, 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*, 𝔈 οὐκ] οὐχ *D* ℵ : οὐχί *B* ἰδού *om.* 𝔏^{t} *vg*^{a}, 𝔈, *Aug.*^{abc} ἅπαντες *om.* *Hier.*, *prom.* οὗτοι *cett.* *Aug.*^{c} : *om.* *Aug.*^{ab} εἰσιν . . . Γαλιλαῖοι] οἱ λαλοῦντες Γαλ. εἰσιν 𝔏^{t} *vg.*, *Aug.*^{c} : οἱ λαλ. γένει εἰσιν Γαλ. *Aug.*^{ab}, *prom.* 8 ἀκούομεν ἕκαστος] agnoscimus in illis *Aug.*^{ab}, *prom.* τὴν (+ἰδίαν 𝔏^{g}, *Aug.*^{c}) διάλεκτον *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, *Aug.*^{ab} *Hier.*, *prom.*: ἐν τῇ διαλέκτῳ 𝔖^{ph} : τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) ἡμῶν *ante* διαλ. *hab.* *AE*, 𝔏^{p} : *om.* *Aug.*^{abc}, *prom.* ἐγενήθημεν *c.* *Th.* ℵ *A E* 363 9 καὶ Ἐλαμῖται *om.* ℵ καὶ οἱ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : οἱ *D* Ἰουδαίαν *cett.* *Aug.*^{b} *Hier.* $\frac{1}{2}$: Ἰουδαῖοι 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug.*^{c} : *om.* *Eus.*: Ἀρμενίαν *Tert.* *Aug.*^{a} : Συρίαν *Hier.* $\frac{1}{2}$: Ἰνδίαν *Chr.* : Ἰδουμαίαν *nescio quis apud Tisch.* τε καί Γ *E* δ : καί *D* Καππαδοκίαν . . . Φρυγίαν] Phrygiam, Cappadociam et

τῆς κατὰ Κυρήνην καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες
Ῥωμαῖοι, Ἰουδαῖοί τε καὶ προσήλυτοι,
11 Κρῆτες καὶ Ἄραβες,
ἀκούομεν λαλούντων αὐτῶν
ταῖς ἡμετέραις γλώσσαις τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ Θεοῦ.
12 ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες
καὶ διηπόρουν ἄλλος πρὸς ἄλλον
ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι καὶ λέγοντες·
Τί θέλει τοῦτο εἶναι;
13 ἕτεροι δὲ διεχλεύαζον λέγοντες
ὅτι γλεύκους **οὗτοι** μεμεστωμένοι εἰσίν.
14 τότε σταθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος
σὺν τοῖς ἕνδεκα **ἀποστόλοις**
ἐπῆρεν **πρῶτος** τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν·
Ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ πάντες
οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ἱερουσαλήμ,
τοῦτο ὑμῖν γνωστὸν ἔστω,
καὶ ἐνωτίσασθε τὰ ῥήματά μου,
15 οὐ γάρ, ὡς ὑμεῖς ὑπολαμβάνετε,

incolentes Pontum et Asiam *Tert.* καί *ante* τὴν Ἀσίαν *om.* *Aug.*^{ab} 10 τε *post* Φρυγίαν *om.* *D* Αἴγυπτον] + τε *D* (*ex l. priore*) οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες] qui hic demorantur 𝔏^{d} : οἱ ἐκεῖ 𝔖 καὶ προσήλυτοι] incolae *Aug.*^{a} 11 Ἄραβοι *D* ἀκούομεν] ἠκούσαμεν 𝔏^{dgt} *vg.*, *Hier.* : ἤκουον *Aug.*^{abc} ἡμετέραις] ἰδίαις *Aug.*^{abc} 12 πάντες *om.* 𝔏^{gp1}, *Aug.*^{ac} διηπόρουν *DCE* δ : διηποροῦντο ℵ *AB* ἄλλος πρὸς ἄλλον *om.* *Aug.*^{ac} ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι *D c. Th.*, *Aug.*^{a} *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* *Aug.*^{c} καί *D* : *om. cett.* *Aug.*^{ac} θέλει] θέλοι ℵ : ἂν θέλοι *E* δ 13 διεχλεύαζον λέγοντες *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug.*^{ac} : διαχλευάζοντες (χλευάζ. *E* δ) ἔλεγον *cett.* ὅτι *om.* *Aug.*^{a} γλεύκους . . . εἰσίν *cett.* *Aug.*^{ac} : μεθύουσιν *c. Th.* : merum biberunt inebriati sunt 𝔖^{vg} : ebrii et musto pleni *Aug.* (*serm.* 266), *cf. Ephr. ad* 1 *Cor.* xiv. 23 οὗτοι *ante* μεμεστ. *hab.* *D*, *post* εἰσίν 𝔏^{t} *vg.*, *Aug.*^{c}, *ante* γλεύκ. *Aug.*^{a} : *om. cett.* 14 τότε σταθεὶς (+ δέ) ὁ Πέτρος *D* : καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα σταθείς 𝔖^{vg} : σταθεὶς δὲ ὁ (*om.* ὁ *CE* δ) Πέτρος *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Aug.*^{c} ἕνδεκα] δέκα *D* ἀποστόλοις *D*, 𝔏^{gpt} *vg.*^{qw}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈^{vt} : discipulis *Aug.*^{c} : *om. cett.* πρῶτος *D* : prior 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*^{w} : πρότερον (*post* αὐτοῦ) *E* : *om. cett.* *Aug.*^{c} εἶπεν *D*, 𝔏^{gp} : ἀπεφθέγξατο αὐτοῖς (+ λέγων *C*, *Aug.*^{c}) *cett.* πάντες (ἅπ. *E* δ) *ante* οἱ κατοικ. *hab.* *D*, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Aug.*^{c} *Hier.* : *post.* Ἱερ. *cett.* ὑμῖν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : ἡμῖν *D* καί *om.* *D*

οὗτοι μεθύουσιν, οὔσης ὥρας τῆς ἡμέρας τρίτης,
16 *ἀλλὰ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον*
διὰ τοῦ προφήτου·
17 *Ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, λέγει* Κύριος,
ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα,
καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτῶν
καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες αὐτῶν,
καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὁράσεις ὄψονται,
*καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι *ἐνυπνίοις* ἐνυπνιασθήσονται·*
18 *καὶ ἐγὼ ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου*
καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου
ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις
ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου,
**καὶ προφητεύσουσιν*.*
19 *καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω*
καὶ σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω,
**αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ*.*
20 *ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος*
καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα,
πρὶν ἐλθεῖν ἡμέραν Κυρίου *τὴν μεγάλην*
**καὶ ἐπιφανῆ*.*
21 *καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ* Κυρίου
σωθήσεται.

15 οὔσης . . . τρίτης *D*, 𝔏^{pt} *vg.*, *Iren. Aug. Gaud. Cass.*: ἔστιν γὰρ ὥρα τρίτη τῆς ἡμ. *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Hier.* 16 προφήτου *D*, *Iren. Iustin. Hil. Aug.*, *reb.*, *Ephr.*: + Ἰωήλ *cett. Orig. Ambst. Gaud. Hier.* 17 ἔσται *D*, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Iren. Orig. Aug.* $\frac{1}{2}$: καὶ ἔσται *cett. Aug.* $\frac{1}{2}$ *alii* ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις *cett.* (*D*), *Iren. Tert. Orig. alii multi*: μετὰ ταῦτα *B*, *Aug.*$\frac{1}{2}$ (LXX): μετὰ ταῦτα ἐν ταῖς ἐσχ. ἡμέραις *C*: μετὰ ταύτας τὰς ἡμέρας 𝔈 κύριος *DE*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, *Iren.*: ὁ θεός Γ δ, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 πᾶσαν σάρκα *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Iren.*: πάσας σάρκας (*cf.* Lk. xxiv. 39) *D* αὐτῶν (*om. Perp.*^{lat}) . . . αὐτῶν *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *Tert. Perp.*^{lat}: ὑμῶν . . . ὑμῶν *cett. Aug. Perp.*^{gr} αἱ θυγ.] θυγ. *D* καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι . . . ἐνυπνιασθήσονται *om. Tert.*: καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι . . . ὄψονται *post* καὶ οἱ πρεσβ. . . . ἐνυπνιασθ. *hab. Aug.* $\frac{1}{2}$ νεανίσκοι *D*, *Perp.*^{lat} *Hier.*, *reb.*: + αὐτῶν *Prisc.*: + ὑμῶν *cett. Aug. Perp.*^{gr} πρεσβύτεροι *DE*, 𝔏^{p}, *Perp.*^{lat} *alii*: + ὑμῶν *cett. Perp.*^{gr} ἐνυπνίοις (-νια *E* 614, 𝔏^{degp} *vg.*) *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): *om. D* 18 καὶ ἐγώ *D*, *Tert.*: καί γε *cett. Aug. Hier.* (καί γε . . . πνεύματός μου *ante* καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι *v.* 17 *hab. Perp.*^{lat}) ἐν ταῖς ἡμ.

22 Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται, ἀκούσατε τοὺς λόγους τούτους.
Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον, ἄνδρα ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ
δεδοκιμασμένον εἰς ὑμᾶς
δυνάμεσιν καὶ τέρασιν καὶ σημείοις,
οἷς ἐποίησεν δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς
ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, καθὼς αὐτοὶ οἴδατε,
23 τοῦτον τῇ ὡρισμένῃ βουλῇ
καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔκδοτον **λαβόντες**
διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων
προσπήξαντες ἀνείλατε·
24 ὃν ὁ Θεὸς ἀνέστησεν λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾅδου,
καθότι οὐκ ἦν δυνατὸν
κρατεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ.
25 Δαυὶδ γὰρ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν·
Προορώμην τὸν Κύριόν μου
ἐνώπιόν μου διὰ παντός,
ὅτι ἐκ δεξιῶν μού ἐστιν ἵνα μὴ σαλευθῶ·
26 διὰ τοῦτο ηὐφράνθη ἡ καρδία μου
καὶ ἠγαλλιάσατο ἡ γλῶσσά μου,
ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἡ σάρξ μου
κατασκηνώσει ἐπ᾽ ἐλπίδι,
27 ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις
τὴν ψυχήν μου εἰς ᾅδην,

ἐκείναις *om.* *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Tert. Prisc.*, *reb.* καὶ προφητεύσουσιν *om.* *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p1}$, *Prisc.*, *reb.* 19 αἷμα . . . καπνοῦ *om.* *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp1}$, *Prisc.* 20 μεταστραφήσεται *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) : -στρέφεται *D* πρίν] + ἤ *B* 614, *Chr.* ἡμέραν *D* ℵ *B* : τὴν ἡμ. *ACE* δ καὶ ἐπιφανῆ *om.* *D* ℵ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Prisc.* 21 καὶ ἔσται . . . σωθήσ. *om.* ℵ ὃς ἐάν *BE* τοῦ *D* : *om.* Γ *E* δ, *Orig.* 22 τούτους] μου 𝕰, *Iren.* ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ *post* ἄνδρα *hab.* *DAE* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, 𝕾; *ante* εἰς ὑμᾶς ℵ *BC*, *vg.*, *Iren. Aug.*; *post* εἰς ὑμᾶς *Tert.* δεδοκιμασμένον *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{pt}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Iren. Aug.* : ἀποδεδειγμένον *cett.* *Tert. Ephr.* ὑμᾶς *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) : ἡμᾶς *D*, *vg.*[a] δυνάμεσιν . . . λαβόντες *v.* 23 *om.* *Aug.* (*Iulian.* vi. 36) οἷς *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$), *Iren.* : ὅσα *D* δι᾽ αὐτοῦ *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ αὐτοί] ὑμεῖς πάντες *E* 23 λαβόντες *DE* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: *om.* *cett.* *Iren. Aug.* προσπήξαντες] + τῷ σταυρῷ 𝕾 24 λύσας] + δι᾽ αὐτοῦ *E* ᾅδου *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gpt}$ *vg.*, *Polyc. Iren. Aug. Ephr.* : θανάτου *cett.* *Eus.* 25 γάρ] μὲν γάρ *E* κύριόν μου *D* ℵ $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: κύριον *cett.* *Iren.* 26 μου *ante* ἡ καρδία *hab.* ℵ *B*, *Clem.* ἐφ᾽ ἐλπίδι *D* ℵ *C* 27 ᾅδου *E* δ, *Orig.*

οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὅσιόν σου
ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν.
28 *ἐγνώρισάς μοι ὁδοὺς ζωῆς,*
πληρώσεις με εὐφροσύνης
μετὰ τοῦ προσώπου σου.
29 *ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐξὸν εἰπεῖν*
μετὰ παρρησίας πρὸς ὑμᾶς
περὶ τοῦ πατριάρχου Δαυίδ,
ὅτι καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν καὶ ἐτάφη,
καὶ τὸ μνημεῖον αὐτοῦ ἔστιν παρ' ἡμῖν
ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης.
30 *προφήτης οὖν ὑπάρχων, καὶ εἰδὼς*
ὅτι ὅρκῳ ὤμοσεν αὐτῷ ὁ Θεὸς
ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ
κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν
καὶ καθίσαι ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ,
31 **προϊδὼν ἐλάλησε περὶ τῆς**
ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ,
ὅτι οὔτε ἐγκατελείφθη εἰς ᾅδου
οὔτε ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ εἶδεν διαφθοράν.
32 *τοῦτον* **οὖν** *τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνέστησεν ὁ Θεός,*
οὗ πάντες ἡμεῖς μάρτυρές ἐσμεν.

28 ἐπλήρωσας $\mathfrak{L}^{t}$ σου] + κύριε $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ 29 ἐξόν] + μοι $\mathfrak{L}^{de}$ *vg.*[a] ὅτι καί] ὅτι $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *Iren.* μνημεῖον *D*: μνῆμα Γ *E* δ, *Orig.* παρ' ἡμῖν *D*: ἐν ἡμῖν Γ *E* δ, *Orig.* 30 κοιλίας $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Iren.* (LXX): καρδίας *D*: ὀσφύος *cett. Tert. Orig.* κατὰ σάρκα . . . Χριστόν *D* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: ἀναστῆσαι τὸν Χριστόν *E*: τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστήσειν τὸν Χρ. *Orig.*: *om. cett. Iren.* καὶ καθίσαι *DE*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: καθίσαι *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$), *Iren. Orig.* ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου *E* δ 31 προϊδών (προειδώς D^{2}) . . . τῆς *om.* D^{1} ἐγκατελείφθη] + ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ *E* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Chr.* εἰς ᾅδην ℵ *B*, *Orig.* οὔτε *D* ℵ *AC*, *Orig.*: οὐδέ *BE* δ 32 οὖν *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, *Amb.*: *om. cett. Iren. Orig.* τόν *om. D* πάντες *post* ἡμεῖς *hab.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dgp}$, $\mathfrak{S}$, *Iren. Aug.*, *om. Amb.* ἐσμεν *post* μάρτ. *hab. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ *vg.*, *Amb. Aug.* $\frac{1}{2}$; *ante* μάρτ. *cett. Iren. Orig. Aug.* $\frac{1}{2}$ 33 τῇ δεξιᾷ οὖν] qui dextera *Iren.* καὶ τήν *D*: τήν τε Γ *E* δ: τήν $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Iren. Amb.* τὸ δῶρον (*praem.* τοῦτο *E*) *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{pt}$ *vg.*[aq], $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Iren. Aug. Hier. multi*: τοῦτο *c. Th.* Γ δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*: *om. D* ὃ καί *D*: ὃ ὑμεῖς Γ, $\mathfrak{L}^{gt}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Iren. Amb.*: ὃ καὶ ὑμεῖς $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: ὃ νῦν ὑμεῖς *E* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Aug.*: ὃ ἰδοὺ ὑμεῖς

33 τῇ δεξιᾷ οὖν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑψωθεὶς
καὶ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος λαβὼν
παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξέχεεν ὑμῖν
⟨τὸ δῶρον⟩
ὃ καὶ βλέπετε καὶ ἀκούετε.
34 οὐ γὰρ Δαυὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς,
εἴρηκεν γὰρ αὐτός·
Λέγει Κύριος τῷ Κυρίῳ μου·
Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,
35 ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου
ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.
36 ἀσφαλῶς οὖν γινωσκέτω πᾶς ὁ οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ
ὅτι καὶ Κύριον καὶ Χριστὸν ὁ Θεὸς ἐποίησεν
τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε.
37 **τότε πάντες οἱ συνελθόντες**
καὶ ἀκούσαντες κατενύγησαν τῇ καρδίᾳ,
καί τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶπαν
πρὸς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς ἀποστόλους·
Τί **οὖν** ποιήσομεν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί;
ὑποδείξατε ἡμῖν.
38 Πέτρος δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς φησιν·
Μετανοήσατε,

𝔖^{vg} ἀκούετε] + σήμερον *Fil.* (vidistis et audistis 𝔏^{d}) 34 εἴρηκεν γάρ *D*, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{vg}: λέγει δέ *cett. Iren.* λέγει *D*: εἶπεν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Iren.* κύριος *D* ℵ *B*: ὁ κύριος *ACE* δ 35 ἄν *om. D* 36 ὁ *DC*: *om.* ℵ *ABE* δ κύριον καὶ Χριστόν *D*, 𝔏^{p}, *Vig.*: + αὐτόν *post* κύριον Γ, 𝔏^{gt} *vg.*, 𝔈, *Iren. alii*, *post* Χρ. *E* δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *post* ἐποίησ. 𝔖^{vg}, *Tert.* ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός ℵ *BC*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, *Tert. Amb.* τόν *om. D* 37 τότε . . . συνελθόντες *D c.Th.*: *om. cett.* καὶ ἀκούσαντες *D c.Th.*: ἀκούσαντες δέ (οὖν *E*, *Aug.*^{c}) *cett.* τῇ καρδίᾳ *cett. Aug.* (*saepius*): τὴν καρδίαν Γ καί . . . εἶπαν *D*, *Ephr.*: εἰπόντες ℵ 614, 𝔖^{ph}, *Aug.*^{c}: εἶπόν τε (καὶ εἶπον *E*) *cett. Aug.* τούς *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *Aug.*^{c} (*et ter*): τοὺς λοιπούς *cett.* οὖν *D*, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔈, *Iren. Aug.* (*ter*): *om. cett.* (*Aug.*^{c}) ποιήσομεν *cett. Iren. Aug.*^{c}: ποιήσωμεν Γ *E* δ ὑποδείξατε ἡμῖν *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{gpt} *vg.*^{aqw}, *Aug.*^{c} (*et saep.*), *prom.*: *om. cett. Ephr.* 38 φησιν *post* αὐτούς *hab. D*, 𝔏^{pt}, *Iren. Cypr.*; *post* μετανοήσατε ℵ *AC*, *vg.*: ἔφη (φησιν 𝔏^{g}) *post* δέ *E* δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, *Aug.*^{c}: *om. B*

καὶ βαπτισθήτω ἕκαστος ὑμῶν
ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι **τοῦ Κυρίου** Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν·
καὶ λήμψεσθε τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος.
39 ὑμῖν γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία
καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν
καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν
ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσηται Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν.
40 ἑτέροις τε λόγοις πλείοσιν
διεμαρτύρατο καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτοὺς λέγων·
Σώθητε ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης τῆς σκολιᾶς.
41 οἱ μὲν οὖν **πιστεύσαντες**
ἀποδεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ
ἐβαπτίσθησαν,
καὶ προσετέθησαν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
ψυχαὶ ὡσεὶ τρισχίλιαι.
42 καὶ ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ
τῶν ἀποστόλων **ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ**
καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου
καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς.

38 ἐν *cett. Iren. Cypr.*: ἐπί ℵ *AE* δ τοῦ κυρίου (+ἡμῶν *Aug.*^{c} *et* $\frac{5}{11}$ *Luc.*) *DE* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, 𝔖, 𝔈, *Cypr. Aug.*: *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$), *Iren. Aug.* $\frac{2}{11}$ *Hier. alii.* Χριστοῦ *om.* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Iren.* ἁμαρτιῶν *cett. Iren. Cypr. Aug.*^{c} *alii*: +ὑμῶν Γ, $\mathfrak{L}^{p2t}$ *vg.*, 𝔈, *Aug. Hier.* (εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρ. *om. Vig.*) 39 ἡμῖν . . . ἡμῶν *D*, *Aug.*^{c} θεὸς ἡμῶν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$): θεὸς ὑμῶν *Luc.* 40 τε *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$): δέ *D* παρεκάλει *cett. Luc.*: +ὁ Πέτρος $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ αὐτούς *om. E* δ, *Chr.*, *post* διεμαρτ. *hab.* $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *utroque loco* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$. ταύτης τῆς σκολιᾶς *D* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{gpt}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Luc.*: τῆς σκολ. ταύτης *cett.* 41 πιστεύσαντες *D*: *om. cett.* ἀποδεξάμενοι (*praem.* ἀσμένως *E* δ, 𝔖) *cett. Clem.*: *om. D* τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ] +καὶ πιστεύσαντες *c. Th.*, *vg.*^{a}, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Aug.*^{c} ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gpt}$, *Aug.*: ἐν (*om.* δ) τῇ ἡμ. ἐκείνῃ Γ, *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ 42 καὶ ἦσαν *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ἦσαν δέ *cett.* προσκαρτεροῦντες] +ὁμοθυμαδόν 614 ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ *D hoc loco*, *post* προσευχαῖς $\mathfrak{L}^{t}$: *om. cett.* τῇ κλάσει] καὶ τῇ κλάσει *E* δ, *vg.*^{q}, 𝔖: τῆς κλάσεως $\mathfrak{L}^{dp}$ *vg.*, 𝔈 προσευχαῖς] +προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδόν $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ *vg.*^{qw} (*ex v.* 46) 43 πολλά τε] πολλὰ δέ ℵ *B*, *vg.*: πολλά *D* σημεῖα] +οὐ μικρά *E* τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστ. *E*, 𝔖 ἐγίνετο (ἐγέν. *E* δ) *cett.*: +ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ *E*, *vg.*^{qw}, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: +ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ· φόβος τε ἦν μέγας ἐπὶ πάντας ℵ *AC*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$ *vg.*

43 ἐγένετο δὲ πάσῃ ψυχῇ φόβος
πολλά τε τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα
διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγίνετο.
44 πάντες τε οἱ πιστεύοντες ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ
καὶ εἶχον πάντα κοινά.
45 καὶ ὅσοι κτήματα εἶχον
ἢ ὑπάρξεις ἐπίπρασκον
καὶ διεμέριζον αὐτὰ **καθ' ἡμέραν** πᾶσιν,
καθότι ἄν τις χρείαν εἶχεν.
46 πάντες τε προσεκαρτέρουν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ
καὶ κατ' οἴκους, κλῶντές τε ἄρτον
μετελάμβανον τροφῆς ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει
47 καὶ ἀφελότητι καρδίας, αἰνοῦντες τὸν Θεὸν
καὶ ἔχοντες χάριν πρὸς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον.
ὁ δὲ Κύριος προσετίθει τοὺς σωζομένους
καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

III

1 **Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις**
Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης ἀνέβαινον εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν
τὸ δειλινὸν ἐπὶ τὴν ὥραν ἐνάτην τῆς προσευχῆς.

44 *πάντες τε D* : *πάντες δέ BE* δ, *Orig.*, *spec.* : *καὶ πάντες* ℵ *AC* *πιστεύσαντες* ℵ *B*, *Orig.* *ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ εἶχον*] *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ εἶχον B*, *Orig.* : *εἶχον ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, *spec.* *πάντα D* : *ἅπαντα* Γ *E* δ, *Orig.* 45 *καὶ ὅσοι . . . ἢ* (et $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *ὑπάρξεις D* : et illi quibus erat possessio $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *καὶ τὰ κτήματα καὶ τὰς ὑπάρξεις cett.* *ἐπίπρασκον*] + *καὶ ἐτίθουν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων* $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ *vg.*[qw] (*ex* iv. 34) *καθ' ἡμέραν D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, *spec.* (*etiam vg.*[q] *post ἀποστόλων*) : *om. cett.* *καθότι ἄν cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) : *τοῖς ἄν D* : *τοῖς χρείαν ἔχουσιν Bl.* 46 *πάντες τε προσεκαρτέρουν D* : *καθ' ἡμέραν τε προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδόν cett.* *ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ante ὁμοθ. hab. C*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{gp1}$ *καὶ κατ' οἴκους* (+ *αν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό ex v.* 47 *D*) *κλῶντές τε ἄρτον D*, $\mathfrak{S}$: *κλῶντές τε κατ' οἶκον* (domos $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ *vg.*) *ἄρτον cett.* 47 *κόσμον D* (*cf.* Joh. xii. 19) : *λαόν cett. Orig.* *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ D* (*duabus lectionibus conflatis*) : *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ* (*Πέτρ. καὶ Ἰωάνν. ἀνέβαινον*) *E* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό cett.* : *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· πάντες δὲ οἱ πιστεύοντες ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό Chr.* III 1 *ἐν δέ . . . ταύταις D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: *καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett. Luc.* Πέτρος *DE* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: + *δέ cett. Luc.* *τὸ δειλινόν D* : *om. cett. Luc.* *ἐνάτην τῆς προσ. D*, $\mathfrak{E}$: *τῆς προσ. τὴν ἐνάτην cett. Luc.*

2 *καὶ* **ἰδού** *τις ἀνὴρ χωλὸς ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ*
ἐβαστάζετο, ὃν ἐτίθουν καθ' ἡμέραν
πρὸς τὴν θύραν τοῦ ἱεροῦ
τὴν λεγομένην ὡραίαν
τοῦ αἰτεῖν ἐλεημοσύνην παρὰ τῶν
εἰσπορευομένων εἰς τὸ ἱερόν.
3 **οὗτος ἀτενίσας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ**
καὶ ἰδὼν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην
μέλλοντας εἰσιέναι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν
ἠρώτα αὐτοὺς ἐλεημοσύνην.
4 *ἐμβλέψας δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἰς αὐτὸν*
σὺν τῷ Ἰωάννῃ εἶπεν· Ἀτένισον εἰς ἡμᾶς.
5 *ὁ δὲ ἠτένισεν αὐτοῖς*
προσδοκῶν τι λαβεῖν παρ' αὐτῶν.
6 *εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος·*
Ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον οὐχ ὑπάρχει μοι,
ὃ δὲ ἔχω τοῦτό σοι δίδωμι.
ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου
**ἔγειραι καὶ* περιπάτει.*

2 ἰδού *D*, 𝔏^{p2}, 𝔖^{vg}. : *om. cett. Luc.* αὐτοῦ *D*, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Luc.* : + ὑπάρχων *cett.* θύραν] πύλην *E* παρὰ τῶν εἰσπορ. *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν εἰσπορ. αὐτῶν *D* 3 οὗτος . . . αὐτοῦ *D*, 𝔏^{h} : *om. cett. Luc.* καὶ ἰδών (et vidit 𝔏^{d}) *D*, 𝔏^{h} : ὃς ἰδών *cett. Luc.* μέλλοντας εἰσιέναι (εἶναι *D*)] introeuntes 𝔏^{gp}, *Luc.* αὐτούς *D*, 𝔏^{hp} : ἀπ' αὐτῶν 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.* ἐλεημοσύνην *D* δ, 𝔏^{ghp}, 𝔖^{ph} : ἐλεημ. λαβεῖν (+ παρ' αὐτῶν *E*, 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*^{q}, 𝔖^{vg}) *cett.* 4 ἐμβλέψας *D*, 𝔏^{hp2} *vg.* : ἀτενίσας *cett. Luc.* ὁ *D* : *om.* Γ *E* δ τῷ *om. D* εἶπεν] καὶ εἶπεν *D* ἀτένισον *D* : βλέψον *cett. Luc.* (ad [. . . . .] et contemplare 𝔏^{h} ; -spice dixit *suppl. Buch.* ; -stans dixit *suppl. Berg.*) ἡμᾶς] ἐμέ 𝔏^{h} 5 ὁ δὲ . . . αὐτοῖς *om.* 𝔈^{vt} ἠτένισεν *Bl.* : ἀτενίσας (adtendebat 𝔏^{d}) *D*, *fort.* ἀτενίσας ἦν : ἐπεῖχεν Γ *E* δ παρ' αὐτῶν (-τοῦ *C*, 𝔏^{h}) *post* λαβεῖν *hab. DE*, 𝔏^{ghp} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, *ante* λαβεῖν *cett.* 6 ὁ *D* : *om.* Γ *E* δ Πέτρος] + πρὸς αὐτόν *c. Th.*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔈, *Cypr.* : + αὐτῷ (*ante* Π.) 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Luc.* ἀργύριον] + μέν 𝔏^{h}, *Cypr.* οὐχ ὑπάρχει μοι *cett. Iren. Cypr. Eus. alii* : οὐκ ἔχω 𝔏^{g}, *Amb. Luc.* σοι δίδωμι *cett. Cypr. Eus. Luc.* : δίδωμί σοι 𝔏^{gh}, *Iren.* τοῦ Ναζωραίου *om. Eus. Hier.* $\frac{2}{3}$ *Amb.* $\frac{2}{4}$ ἔγειραι (-ρε *ACE*) καί *cett. Iren. Cypr. Eus. Hier. alii multi* : *om. D* ℵ *B*, 𝔈 περιπάτει] + ἐν εἰρήνῃ 𝔏^{p} 7 καὶ πιάσας . . . ἤγειρεν *om. Iren.* χειρός] + αὐτοῦ 𝔏^{ghp}, *Cypr. Luc.* ἤγειρεν *DE* δ, *vg*^{a} : + αὐτόν *cett. Cypr.*

7 *καὶ πιάσας αὐτὸν τῆς δεξιᾶς χειρὸς ἤγειρὲν,*
καὶ παραχρῆμα **ἐστάθη,**
καὶ *ἐστερεώθησαν αὐτοῦ*
†αἱ βάσεις καὶ τὰ σφυρά,
8 *καὶ περιεπάτει χαίρων*
⟨**καὶ ἐξαλλόμενος**⟩,
καὶ εἰσῆλθεν σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν
αἰνῶν τὸν Θεόν.
9 *καὶ εἶδεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς αὐτὸν περιπατοῦντα*
καὶ αἰνοῦντα τὸν Θεόν,
10 *ἐπεγίνωσκόν τε αὐτὸν ὅτι οὗτος ἦν*
ὁ πρὸς τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην καθεζόμενος
ἐπὶ τῇ ὡραίᾳ πύλῃ τοῦ ἱεροῦ,
καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν θάμβους καὶ ἐκστάσεως
ἐπὶ τῷ γεγενημένῳ αὐτῷ.
11 *ἐκπορευομένου δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ Ἰωάννου*
συνεξεπορεύετο κρατῶν αὐτούς·
οἱ δὲ θαμβηθέντες ἔστησαν
ἐν τῇ στοᾷ τῇ καλουμένῃ Σολομῶνος.

Luc. καὶ παραχρῆμα (confestimque 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.*) *D*, 𝔏^{ghp} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Iren.*: παραχρῆμα δέ *cett.* ἐστάθη καί *D*, 𝔏^{h} : *om. cett. Iren. Luc.* αἱ βάσεις *post* αὐτοῦ *hab. DE* δ, *Iren.*; *ante* αὐτοῦ *cett. Luc.* σφυρά *DE* δ : σφυδρά Γ 8 καὶ περιεπάτει 𝔏^{h}, *Iren.* : καὶ ἐξαλλόμενος ἔστη καὶ περιεπάτει *cett.* (*D*) χαίρων καὶ ἐξαλλόμενος 𝔏^{h} : χαιρόμενος *D* : χαίρων *E* : *om. cett. Iren.* καὶ εἰσῆλθεν] εἰσῆλθεν δέ 𝔏^{h} τὸ ἱερόν *D*, 𝔏^{h} : + περιπατῶν καὶ ἁλλόμενος *cett. Iren.* αἰνῶν *DA*, 𝔏^{h}, *Luc.* : καὶ αἰνῶν *cett.* (𝔏^{g}), *Iren.* 9 αὐτόν *post* λαός *hab. D* Γ, *vg.*, *ante* πᾶς *E*, 𝔏^{ghp}, 𝔖, *Luc.* τὸν θεὸν αἰνοῦντα 𝔏^{h} 10 τε] δέ Γ, 𝔏^{h} *vg.* αὐτόν *om.* ℵ, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Luc.* οὗτος *DBE* δ, 𝔖, 𝔈 : αὐτός *cett. Luc.* καθεζόμενος *D* : καθήμενος Γ *E* δ ἐπὶ τῇ ὡραίᾳ πύλῃ] ad horr[eam por]tam 𝔏^{h} ἐπλήσθ.] + πάντες 𝔏^{hp}, *Bl.* καὶ ἐκστάσεως] et stupebant 𝔏^{hp}, 𝔈 (καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο *Bl.*) : extasi stupefacti *vg.*[a] ἐπὶ τῷ γεγενημένῳ αὐτῷ (*om.* αὐτῷ 𝔖^{vg}) *D*, 𝔖^{vg} : ἐπὶ τῷ συμβεβηκότι αὐτῷ Γ *E* δ, 𝔏^{gp2}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Luc.*: ἐφ' ᾧ αὐτῷ συμβέβηκεν ἴασις 𝔏^{hp1}, *Bl.* 11 ἐκπορευομένου (-ων 𝔏^{h}) δὲ τοῦ Π. καὶ Ἰ. (+ καὶ αὐτός 𝔏^{h}) συνεξ. κρατῶν αὐτούς *D*, 𝔏^{h} : κρατοῦντος δὲ (+ τοῦ ἰαθέντος χωλοῦ δ, 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*[q]) τὸν Π. καὶ τὸν (*om.* τόν *CE* δ) Ἰ. *cett.* οἱ δέ . . . Σολομῶνος (+ ἔκθαμβοι) *D* : συνέδραμεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ στοᾷ τῇ καλουμένῃ Σολ. ἔκθαμβοι (mirabundus *post* λαός *hab.* 𝔖^{vg}) *cett.*

12 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς·
Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται, τί θαυμάζετε ἐπὶ τούτῳ;
ἢ ἡμῖν τί ἀτενίζετε,
ὡς **ἡμῶν** τῇ ἰδίᾳ δυνάμει ἢ εὐσεβείᾳ
τοῦτο πεποιηκότων τοῦ περιπατεῖν αὐτόν;
13 ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Θεὸς Ἰακώβ,
ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν,
ἐδόξασεν τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν **Χριστόν**,
ὃν ὑμεῖς μὲν παρεδώκατε **εἰς κρίσιν**
καὶ ἀπηρνήσασθε **αὐτὸν**
κατὰ πρόσωπον Πιλάτου
τοῦ κρίναντος, ἐκείνου
ἀπολύειν **αὐτὸν θέλοντος**.
14 ὑμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον
ἐβαρύνατε, καὶ ῃτήσατε ἄνδρα φονέα
χαρισθῆναι ὑμῖν.
15 τὸν δὲ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἀπεκτείνατε,
ὃν ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν,
οὗ ἡμεῖς μάρτυρές ἐσμεν.
16 καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ
τοῦτον, ὃν θεωρεῖτε καὶ οἴδατε,

12 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Π. εἶπεν *D*: ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ (*om.* ὁ *E* δ) Π. ἀπεκρίνατο (εἶπεν $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, 𝔈: + καὶ εἶπεν $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$) *cett. Cass.* πρὸς αὐτούς *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, 𝔈: πρὸς τὸν λαόν (+ καὶ εἶπεν $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$) *cett. Cass.* ἤ] καί *Iren.* ἡμῶν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Iren.*: *om. cett.* τῇ ἰδίᾳ *D*: ἰδίᾳ Γ *E* δ ἢ εὐσεβείᾳ] ἢ ἐξουσίᾳ $\mathfrak{L}^{hp2}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. Iren.* πεποιηκότων *D*, *Sever.*: πεποιηκόσιν *cett.* τοῦ *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$): τοῦτο *D* 13 καί *post* Ἀβραάμ *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, *Iren. Bl.* θεὸς Ἰσαάκ . . . θεὸς Ἰακώβ *D* ℵ *AC*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{E}^{vt}$, *Iren.*: Ἰσαάκ . . . Ἰακώβ *cett.*, *const. Ap.* ὁ θεός . . . ἡμῶν *om. Sever.* Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν *D*: Ἰησοῦν . . . $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: Ἰησοῦν *cett.*: *om. vg.*[a], *Iren.* ἡμεῖς (*om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *D* μέν *om. D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$. εἰς κρίσιν (κριτήριον *E*) *D c. Th. E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$, *Iren.*: *om. cett.* ἀπηρνήσασθε (abnegastis) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$: ἠρνήσασθε (negastis) *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) αὐτόν *DE* δ, 𝔖: *om.* Γ, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, *Iren.* τοῦ (*om.* Γ *E*) κρίναντος ἐκείνου *cett.*: *om. Iren.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *sec. Berger*) αὐτὸν θέλοντος *D*, *Iren. Ephr.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *sec. Buch.*): *om. cett.* 14 ἐβαρύνατε *D*, *Iren.*: ἠρνήσασθε *cett.*: onerastis et negastis *Aug.* (*pecc. mer.* I. 52): sprevistis et negastis *Ephr.* ῃτήσατε *D*: ῃτήσασθε Γ *E* δ: + μᾶλλον *c. Th. E* χαρισθῆναι *cett. Iren.*: ζῆν καὶ χαρισθ. *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Aug. Bl.* 15 ζωῆς] + κρεμάσαντες $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Vigil.* ἡμεῖς *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$): ὑμεῖς *D*

ἐστερέωσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ
τὴν ὁλοκληρίαν ταύτην
ἀπέναντι πάντων ὑμῶν.
17 *καὶ νῦν,* ἄνδρες *ἀδελφοί, ἐπιστάμεθα*
ὅτι ὑμεῖς μὲν *κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε* τὸ πονηρόν,
ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν.
18 *ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ὃ προκατήγγειλεν*
διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν
παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτοῦ, ἐπλήρωσεν οὕτως.
19 *μετανοήσατε οὖν καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε*
εἰς τὸ ἐξαλειφθῆναι τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν,
ὅπως ἂν ἐπέλθωσιν καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως
ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Κυρίου,
20 *καὶ ἀποστείλῃ τὸν προκεχειρισμένον ὑμῖν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν·*
21 *ὃν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δέξασθαι*
ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων
ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ Θεὸς διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ
τῶν προφητῶν.
22 *Μωσῆς μὲν εἶπεν* πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν
ὅτι Προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν

16 ἐπί *om.* ℵ *B* ὅν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *om. D* οἴδατε] + ὅτι *D* (*om.* 𝔏^{d}) τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ] καὶ ἰάσατο 𝔖^{vg} ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ *om.* 𝔏^{h} 17 ἄνδρες *DE*, 𝔏^{hp} *vg.*^{q}, *om. cett. Iren.* ἐπιστάμεθα (*om.* 𝔏^{d}) *D*, 𝔏^{h}, *Ephr.*: οἶδα *cett. Iren.* ὑμεῖς μέν *D*, 𝔏^{h} : *om. cett. Iren.* τὸ (*om. D*) πονηρόν *D c. Th.*, 𝔏^{ghp} *vg.*^{a} : *om. cett.* (*cf.* v. 4) ὥσπερ . . . ὑμῶν *om. Iren.* 18 ὅ *D*, 𝔏^{h} : ὅς 𝔏^{g}, *Vig.* : ἅ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Iren.* ἐπλήρωσεν οὕτως] οὕτως ἐπλήρ. 𝔏^{gp} : καὶ ἐπλήρ. 𝔏^{h} : ἐπλήρ. *Iren. Vig.* 19 εἰς] πρός ℵ *B* ὑμῶν *post* τὰς ἁμαρτ. *hab. D*, 𝔏^{ghp} *vg.*, 𝔖, *Iren. Tert.*, *spec.*: *ante* τὰς ἁμαρτ. Γ *E* δ ἐπέλθωσιν *D*, 𝔏^{h}, *Tert.* : ἔλθωσιν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Iren.* (+ ὑμῖν *ante* ἐπέλθ. *Tert.*, *post* ἔλθ. 𝔖, *ante* ἀναψ. 𝔏^{h}, *post* ἀναψ. *E*) 20 τὸν προκεκηρυγμένον *Orig. Eus.* Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν] Ἰησ. Χριστόν *AC* 614, 𝔏^{dh} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} : Χριστόν *Tert. Eus.* 21 μέν *om.* 𝔏^{h}, *Tert.* χρόνον *D* στόματος] + πάντων *E* δ, 𝔖^{ph} τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ τῶν προφητῶν *D*, 𝔏^{ghp}, *Iren. Tert.* : τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν (*sim.*) *cett.* (*cf.* Lk. i. 70) 22 μὲν γάρ δ : γάρ 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 πρός . . . ἡμῶν (ὑμῶν *E* : *om.* δ, 𝔖^{ph}) *DE* δ, 𝔏^{gph} *vg.*^{q}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈, *Iren.* : *om.* Γ, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Ambst.* ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν (ἡμῶν *ACE* δ, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈^{vt}) *cett. Iren.* : ὁ θεός *B*, 𝔏^{hp} : *om.* 𝔖^{vg}

ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν,
ὡς ἐμέ· αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε
κατὰ πάντα ὅσα ἂν λαλήσῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς·
23 *ἔσται δὲ πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἥτις ἂν μὴ ἀκούσῃ*
τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου ἐξολεθρεύσεται
24 *ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ. καὶ πάντες οἱ προφῆται ἀπὸ Σαμουὴλ*
καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς, ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν,
καὶ κατήγγειλαν τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας.
25 *ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν προφητῶν*
καὶ τῆς διαθήκης ἧς ὁ Θεὸς διέθετο
πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν λέγων πρὸς Ἀβραάμ·
Καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου ἐνευλογηθήσονται
πᾶσαι αἱ πατρίαι τῆς γῆς.
26 *ὑμῖν πρῶτον ὁ Θεὸς ἀναστήσας τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ*
ἐξαπέστειλεν εὐλογοῦντα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἀποσ-
τρέφειν ἕκαστον ἐκ τῶν πονηριῶν ὑμῶν.

IV

1 *Λαλούντων δὲ αὐτῶν*
πρὸς τὸν λαὸν **τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα**
ἐπέστησαν οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι

22 ἐμέ *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$): ἐμοῦ *D* κατά . . . ὑμᾶς *om. Tert. Orig. Eus.* $\frac{1}{2}$ 23 ἔσται δὲ (καὶ ἔσται $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Orig.*) πᾶσα *cett. Iren. Eus.* $\frac{1}{3}$: πᾶσα δέ $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Eus.* $\frac{2}{3}$ ἄν *DBE*, *Orig. Eus.* : ἐάν ℵ *AC* δ ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ] ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτῆς *Eus.* $\frac{3}{3}$ 24 καὶ πάντες *D* : καὶ πάντες δέ Γ *E* δ οἱ προφῆται *om. Iren.* ὅσοι *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$), *Iren.* : ὁ *D* : οἱ ℵ *C*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp2}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{p1}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$ καὶ *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{ghp2}$ ταύτας τὰς ἡμέρας $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ 25 οἱ *om. D* 614, *Chr.* ὁ θεὸς διέθετο *DB*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$, *Iren.* : διέθ. ὁ θεός *cett.* ὑμῶν *ABE* εὐλογηθήσονται *B* 383 πατρίαι] nationes $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: gentes *c.Th.* (?) 26 ὁ θεός *post* ἀναστήσας *hab.* ℵ *BC*, *om.* 383 αὐτοῦ] + Ἰησοῦν δ ἐξαπέστειλεν *D* : ἀπέστειλεν Γ *E* δ εὐλογοῦντας *D* ὑμᾶς *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{ghp}$ $\mathfrak{S}$, *Iren.* : αὐτόν *cett.* ἕκαστος *D* ὑμῶν] αὐτῶν *C*, $\mathfrak{L}^{dghp}$ *vg.*, *Iren. Cass.* : *om. B* IV 1 τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα *D c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *vg.*^{w}, *Cass.* : ταῦτα τὰ ῥήμ. *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ *vg.*^{q}, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Luc.* : *om. cett.* ἐπέστησαν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{ghp}$ *vg.*, *Luc.* : + αὐτοῖς *cett.* ἱερεῖς *cett. Tert.* : ἀρχιερεῖς *BC* : sacerdotes et pontifices $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς (οἱ στρατηγοί $\mathfrak{S}$) τοῦ ἱεροῦ *cett.* (*post* Σαδδ. $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *post* ἱερεῖς *cett.*) : *om. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ (στίχον *post* Σαδδ. *excidisse opinor*) 2 καταπονούμενοι (*ex* καια-) *D* : διαπονούμενοι Γ *E* δ ἀναγγέλλειν *D* : καταγγέλλειν

καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ,
2 καταπονούμενοι
διὰ τὸ διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς τὸν λαὸν
καὶ ἀναγγέλλειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν
ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν.
3 καὶ ἐπιβαλόντες αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας
⟨**ἐκράτησαν αὐτοὺς**⟩,
καὶ ἔθεντο εἰς τήρησιν εἰς τὴν ἐπαύριον·
ἦν γὰρ ἑσπέρα ἤδη.
4 πολλοὶ δὲ τῶν ἀκουσάντων τὸν λόγον
ἐπίστευσαν,
ἀριθμός τε ἐγενήθη ἀνδρῶν ὡς χιλιάδες πέντε.
5 ἐγένετο δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον,
συνήχθησαν οἱ ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι
καὶ γραμματεῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ,
6 καὶ Ἄννας ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς
καὶ Καϊάφας καὶ Ἰωνάθας καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος,
καὶ ὅσοι ἦσαν ἐκ γένους ἀρχιερατικοῦ,
7 καὶ στήσαντες αὐτοὺς ἐν μέσῳ
ἐπυνθάνοντο· Ἐν ποίᾳ δυνάμει
ἢ ἐν ποίῳ ὀνόματι ἐποιήσατε τοῦτο ὑμεῖς;

Γ *E* δ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει *D*: ἐν τῷ (*om.* τῷ *Iren.*^{gr}) Ἰησοῦ τὴν ἀνάστασιν *cett.* *Iren.*^{gr} τῶν νεκρῶν *D* 614, *Iren.*^{gr}, 𝔏^{gp}: τὴν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν *cett.* 3 ἐπιβαλόντες *D*, 𝔏^{h}: ἐπέβαλον *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) αὐτοῖς *om.* 𝔏^{h} ἐκράτησαν αὐτούς 𝔏^{h}: *om. cett.* (*D*) καὶ ἔθεντο] + αὐτούς *ACE* 614, *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈 ἐπαύριον *D*: αὔριον Γ *E* δ ἦν δὲ ἤδη ἑσπέρα 𝔏^{h} 4 τὸν λόγον *om.* *A*, 𝔏^{h} ἀριθμός τε ἐγενήθη *Bl.*: καὶ ἀριθμός τε ἐγεν. *D*: ἀριθμὸς δὲ ἐγεν. 𝔏^{h}: καὶ ἐγεν. (+ ὁ *AE* δ) ἀριθμός *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) ἀνδρῶν *D*: τῶν ἀνδρῶν Γ *E* δ: αὐτῶν 𝔏^{gh} 5 ἐγένετο δέ] καί 𝔖^{vg}: *om.* 𝔏^{h} αὔριον ἡμέραν *D* συνήχθησαν *D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg}: συναχθῆναι *cett.* οἱ ἄρχοντες *D*, 𝔖^{vg}: magistratus et prin[cipes] 𝔏^{h}: αὐτῶν τοὺς ἄρχοντας (τοὺς ἄρχ. αὐτῶν 𝔏^{p} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}) *cett.* οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ γραμματεῖς *D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg}: τοὺς (*om.* *E* δ) πρεσβυτέρους καὶ τοὺς (*om.* τούς *E* δ) γραμμ. *cett.* ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ *om.* 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Bl.* 6 Ἄννας ὁ ἀρχιερεύς . . . Ἀλέξανδρος] *accusativos continuant* *E* δ, *Chr.* Ἰωνάθας *D*: Ἰωάθας 𝔏^{dp2}: Ἰωνάθαν 𝔏^{gp1}: Ἰωάννης *cett.* (𝔏^{h}). *Cf. Joseph.*, *Ant.* xviii. 4, 3, *Hier.* (*Nom. Hebr.*) 7 μέσῳ *DE* δ: τῷ μέσῳ Γ ἐπυνθάνοντο] + λέγοντες 𝔏^{g} ἐποιήσατε τοῦτο ὑμεῖς] fecistis hoc signum 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q}: id fecissent 𝔏^{h}

8 *τότε Πέτρος πλησθεὶς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου*
εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἄρχοντες τοῦ λαοῦ
καὶ πρεσβύτεροι **τοῦ Ἰσραήλ,**
9 *εἰ ἡμεῖς σήμερον ἀνακρινόμεθα* **ἀφ' ὑμῶν**
ἐπ' εὐεργεσίᾳ ἀνθρώπου ἀσθενοῦς,
ἐν τίνι οὗτος σέσωσται,
10 *γνωστὸν ἔστω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν*
καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ Ἰσραὴλ
ὅτι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου,
ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε,
ὃν ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν,
ἐν τούτῳ οὗτος παρέστηκεν
ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ὑγιής,
⟨**ἐν ἄλλῳ δὲ οὐδενί**⟩.
11 *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ λίθος ὁ ἐξουθενηθεὶς ὑφ' ὑμῶν*
τῶν οἰκοδομούντων,
ὁ γενόμενος εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας.
12 *οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἕτερον ὄνομα ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν*
τὸ δεδομένον ἀνθρώποις
ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς.

8 τοῦ λαοῦ *cett. Iren. Cypr.* : *om.* 𝔏^{h} τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (οἴκου Ἰσρ. 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*^{qw}, 𝔖^{vg}) *cett. Iren. Cypr.* : *om.* Γ (*post* Ἰσρ. + ἀκούσατε *E*, 𝔏^{gp2} *vg.*^{q2}, 𝔖^{vg}) 9 εἰ] ἰδού *Cypr.* (si 𝔏^{h} *sec. Berg.*, ecce *sec. Buch.*) ἀφ' ὑμῶν *cett. Iren. Cypr.* : *om.* Γ δ, *vg.*, 𝔈 ἐπ' εὐεργ. *D* 383 : ἐπὶ εὐεργ. Γ *E* 614 10 ἔστω ὑμῖν πᾶσιν γνωστόν 𝔏^{h}, *Cypr.* Ἰησοῦ *cett. Iren. Cypr.* : τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ *E*, 𝔏^{h} *vg.* ὅν . . . ὅν] ὃν μέν . . . ὃν δέ 𝔈 ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ὑγιὴς παρέστηκεν 𝔏^{h}, *Cypr.* ὑμῶν] + σήμερον *E* ἐν ἄλλῳ δὲ οὐδενί *c.Th.*, 𝔏^{h}, *Cypr.* : καὶ ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενί *E* : *om. cett.* (*D*) 11 ὑμῶν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : ἡμῶν *D* 614 οἰκοδομούντων *E* δ, 𝔏^{ghp} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Iren. Cypr. Aug.* : οἰκοδόμων *D* Γ, 𝔖^{ph}, *Orig.* γωνίας 𝔏^{h}, *Cypr. Aug.* (*pecc. mer.* I. 52) : + καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενὶ ἡ σωτηρία (*om.* ἡ σωτ. *D*, 𝔏^{p}) *cett.* (καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἕτερον ὄνομα ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν *med. om. Iren.*) 12 οὐ *D*, 𝔏^{h}, *Cypr. Aug.* : οὐδέ (οὔτε *E*) *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) ἐστιν ἕτερον ὄνομα *D*, 𝔏^{p}, *Iren. Aug.* : ἕτερον ὄνομά ἐστιν ℵ, 𝔏^{g} : ὄνομά ἐστιν ἕτερον *B* δ (ἔστιν γὰρ ὄνομα ἕτερον 𝔏^{h}, *Cypr.*) τὸ δεδομένον ἀνθρώποις *om. Orig.*^{lat} *Aug.* $\frac{4}{6}$ ἀνθρώποις *cett. Iren. Cypr. alii* : ἐν ἀνθρώποις Γ *E* δ, 𝔈 13 θεωροῦντες δέ] ἀκούσαντες δέ (+ πάντες 𝔏^{h}) 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg} καὶ ἰδιῶται *om. D* (ἰδιῶταί εἰσιν

13 *θεωροῦντες δὲ τὴν τοῦ Πέτρου παρρησίαν*
καὶ Ἰωάννου, καὶ καταλαβόμενοι
*ὅτι ἄνθρωποι ἀγράμματοί εἰσιν *καὶ ἰδιῶται* ἐθαύμαζον,*
ἐπεγίνωσκον δὲ αὐτοὺς ὅτι σὺν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἦσαν.
14 *τόν τε ἄνθρωπον βλέποντες*
σὺν αὐτοῖς ἑστῶτα τὸν τεθεραπευμένον
οὐδὲν εἶχον **ποιῆσαι ἢ** *ἀντειπεῖν·*
15 *κελεύσαντες δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔξω τοῦ συνεδρίου ἀπαχθῆναι*
συνέβαλον πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες·
16 *Τί ποιήσομεν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις;*
ὅτι μὲν γὰρ γνωστὸν σημεῖον
γέγονεν δι' αὐτῶν,
πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐνοικοῦσιν Ἰερουσαλὴμ
φανερώτερόν ἐστιν, καὶ οὐ δυνάμεθα ἀρνεῖσθαι.
17 *ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ ἐπὶ πλέον τι διανεμηθῇ εἰς τὸν λαὸν*
⟨**τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα**⟩,
⟨**ἀπειλῇ**⟩ *ἀπειλησώμεθα αὐτοῖς*
μηκέτι λαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ
μηδενὶ ἀνθρώπων.
18 **συγκατατιθεμένων δὲ αὐτῶν τῇ γνώμῃ,**

καὶ ἀγράμμ. 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈, *Ambst. Luc.*) *ἐπεγίνωσκον* (*praem. τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν*) ... *ἦσαν post ἀντειπεῖν* (*v.* 14) *hab.* 𝔏^{h} *δέ D*, 𝔏^{e} : *τε cett.* (*E*), *Orig.* *ἦσαν*] conversati sunt 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg} 14 *τόν τε* (*om. τε D*) *ἄνθρωπον*] illum infirmum 𝔏^{h} *ποιῆσαι ἤ D*, 𝔏^{h} : *om. cett.* (𝔏^{d}) 15 *κελεύσαντες δέ* (*om. δέ D*, autem 𝔏^{d}) *cett.* : tunc ..... cuti (adsecuti *Berg.* : collocuti *Buch.*) 𝔏^{h} : tunc praeceperunt 𝔖^{vg} *ἀπαχθῆναι D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖 : *ἀπελθεῖν cett.* (𝔏^{d}) *συνέβαλον DE* : *συνέβαλλον cett.* (𝔏^{e}) 16 *ποιήσομεν D* (faciamus 𝔏^{d}) 614 : *ποιήσωμεν* Γ *E* 383 *τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις*] *ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί* (*ex* ii. 37) 𝔈^{vt}, *vg.*^{qw} *σημεῖον post γέγον. hab.* 𝔏^{gp}, *Luc.* *γέγονεν cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : *γεγονέναι D*^{1} : factum 𝔏^{h} (*τὸ μὲν γὰρ γνωστὸν σημεῖον γεγονέναι Bl.*) *δι' αὐτῶν*] ab iis 𝔏^{h} *πᾶσιν cett. Luc.* : + *ἀνθρώποις* 𝔏^{g} *φανερώτερον D* : *φανερόν cett.* (𝔏^{d}) *cf.* x. 28, xvii. 21 17 *ἀλλ' ἵνα cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : *ἵνα D* *τι D*, 𝔏^{p} : *om. cett.* *τὰ* (*διὰ τά c.Th.*) *ῥήματα ταῦτα* (istorum 𝔏^{h}) *c.Th. E*, 𝔏^{gh}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Luc.* : *om. cett.* (*D*) *ἀπειλῇ E* δ, 𝔖^{ph} (*cf. Ephr. ad* v. 40) : *om. cett.* (*D*), *Luc.* (*cf.* v. 28, xxiii. 14, Lk. xxii. 15) *ἀπειλησόμεθα* (+ *οὖν*) *D* 18 *συγκατ. δὲ αὐτῶν* (+ *πάντων* 𝔏^{dg}, *Luc.*) *τῇ γνώμῃ* (*om. τῇ γνώμῃ* 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.*) *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{gh}, *Luc.* : *om. cett.*

φωνήσαντες αὐτοὺς παρήγγειλαν
τὸ καθόλου μὴ φθέγγεσθαι
μηδὲ διδάσκειν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.
19 ἀποκριθέντες δὲ Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης
εἶπον πρὸς αὐτούς·
Εἰ δίκαιόν ἐστιν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν ἀκούειν
μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ κρίνατε·
20 οὐ δυνάμεθα γὰρ ἡμεῖς
ἃ εἴδαμεν καὶ ἠκούσαμεν μὴ λαλεῖν.
21 οἱ δὲ προσαπειλησάμενοι ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς,
μὴ **εὑρίσκοντες αἰτίαν** τὸ πῶς κολάσωνται αὐτούς,
διὰ τὸν λαόν, ὅτι πάντες
ἐδόξαζον τὸν Θεὸν ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι·
22 ἐτῶν γὰρ πλειόνων τεσσεράκοντα ἦν ὁ ἄνθρωπος
ἐφ᾽ ὃν ἐγεγόνει τὸ σημεῖον τῆς ἰάσεως.
23 ἀπολυθέντες δὲ ἦλθον πρὸς τοὺς ἰδίους,
καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν ὅσα πρὸς αὐτοὺς
οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι εἶπαν.
24 οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες **καὶ ἐπιγνόντες τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐνέργειαν**
ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἦραν φωνὴν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν
καὶ εἶπαν,
Δέσποτα, σὺ **ὁ Θεὸς** ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν
καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς,

18 φωνήσαντες αὐτούς *D c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.* : καὶ καλέσαντες αὐτούς *cett.* : *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ παρήγγειλαν] + αὐτοῖς δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Luc.* τὸ (*om.* ℵ *B*) καθόλου *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) : τὸ κατὰ τό *D* 19 ἀποκριθέντες (-κριθείς *D*) δὲ Π. καὶ Ἰωάννης *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Luc.* : ὁ δὲ Π. καὶ Ἰωάν. ἀποκριθέντες *cett. Cass.* πρὸς αὐτούς *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.*, *ante* εἶπον *hab.* δ δίκαιόν ἐστιν] τοῦτο ὑμῖν δίκαιον φαίνεται *E* μᾶλλον ἀκούειν *E*, *vg.* 20 μή *om. D* 21 μή . . . αἰτίαν (nihil . . . causam $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: μηδέν *cett. Luc.* διά] φοβούμενοι *E* ὅτι πάντες] πάντες γάρ *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Luc.* ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι] id quod factum fuerat in eo quod acciderat *vg.* (*duabus lectt. conflatis*) 22 πλειόνων (ἦν πλειόνων *D*) τεσσεράκοντα ἦν *D*, *Iren.* : ἦν πλειόνων τεσσ. *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$), *Luc.* γεγόνει *DB* σημεῖον *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, *Iren. Luc.* : + τοῦτο *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) 23 ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἀπολυθέντες *E* ἀπήγγειλαν] + αὐτοῖς $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$ 24 οἱ δέ] + πάντες $\mathfrak{E}^{vt}$ καὶ ἐπιγνόντες . . . ἐνέργειαν *D*: *om. cett. Iren. Luc.* φωνήν] + αὐτῶν *E*, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: + πάντες $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ θεόν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) : κύριον *Luc.* ὁ θεός (es deus $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, *Iren.*) *cett. Iren. Luc.* : *om.* Γ, *vg.*, *Aug. Hil.* 25 ὁ] ὅς *D* διὰ

25 ὁ διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου διὰ τοῦ στόματος λαλήσας
Δαυὶδ παιδός σου·
Ἱνατί ἐφρύαξαν ἔθνη,
καὶ λαοὶ ἐμελέτησαν κενά;
26 παρέστησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς,
καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ
κατὰ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ·
27 συνήχθησαν γὰρ ἐπ' ἀληθείας ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ
ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιόν σου παῖδα Ἰησοῦν, ὃν ἔχρισας,
Ἡρώδης τε καὶ Πόντιος Πιλᾶτος
σὺν ἔθνεσιν καὶ λαοῖς Ἰσραήλ,
28 ποιῆσαι ὅσα ἡ χείρ σου καὶ ἡ βουλή σου
προώρισεν γενέσθαι.
29 καὶ τὰ νῦν, Κύριε, ἔπιδε ἐπὶ τὰς ἀπειλὰς αὐτῶν,
καὶ δὸς τοῖς δούλοις σου
μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον σου,
30 ἐν τῷ τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐκτείνειν εἰς ἴασιν
καὶ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα γενέσθαι
διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ ἁγίου παιδός σου Ἰησοῦ.
31 καὶ δεηθέντων αὐτῶν
ἐσαλεύθη ὁ τόπος ἐν ᾧ ἦσαν συνηγμένοι,
καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν ἅπαντες τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος,
καὶ ἐλάλουν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ μετὰ παρρησίας

πνεύματος ἁγίου διὰ τοῦ στόματος *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Iren. Hier.*: τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύμ. ἁγίου στόματος Γ *E*: διὰ στόματος δ: διὰ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Aug. Hil.* λαλήσας (*hoc loco*) *D*: εἰπών (*post* σου) Γ *E* δ Δαυίδ] + τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈, *Iren. Luc.*: + τοῦ ἁγίου *Aug. Hil.* παιδός σου] + διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph} κενά *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): καινά *D* ℵ *A* 27 ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ *om.* δ παῖδά σου *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Iren.*: σου παῖδα *D* 614, *Hil.* Ἰησοῦν *cett.* (*Luc.*): *om.* 𝔏^{g}, *Tert.*: + Χριστόν 𝔈^{vt} σὺν ἔθνεσιν *om. Aug. Hil.* λαός *E*, *Aug. Hil.* 28 ὅσα] ἃ 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, *Luc.* βουλή σου] βουλή *AB*, 𝔏^{eg} *vg.*^{a}, *Aug. Hil. Luc. Bl.* γενέσθαι *om.* 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.* 29 ἔφιδε *DAE* πάσης παρρ. *cett.* (*D*), *Luc.*: παρρ. πάσης Γ 383, 𝔏^{d} (*om.* πάσης 𝔖^{vg}) 30 σου ἐκτείνειν *DE*: + σε ℵ δ (ἐκτ. σε *B*, σε ἐκτ. *A*, *sine* σου) ἰάσεις 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈, *Luc.* 31 τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύμ.] πνεύμ. ἁγίου *E* δ, 𝔏^{g}, *Aug. Luc.* παρρησίας] + πάσης 𝔏^{gp2}, 𝔈, *Luc.*

παντὶ τῷ θέλοντι πιστεύειν.
32 *τοῦ δὲ πλήθους τῶν πιστευσάντων*
ἦν καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία,
καὶ οὐκ ἦν διάκρισις *ἐν* **αὐτοῖς οὐδεμία,**
καὶ οὐδείς τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ
ἔλεγεν ἴδιον εἶναι,
ἀλλὰ ἦν αὐτοῖς πάντα κοινά.
33 *καὶ δυνάμει μεγάλῃ*
ἀπεδίδουν τὸ μαρτύριον οἱ ἀπόστολοι
τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Κυρίου *Ἰησοῦ* Χριστοῦ·
χάρις τε μεγάλη ἦν ἐπὶ πάντας αὐτούς.
34 *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνδεής τις ὑπῆρχεν ἐν αὐτοῖς·*
ὅσοι γὰρ κτήτορες **ἦσαν** *χωρίων*
ἢ οἰκιῶν, *πωλοῦντες*
καὶ φέροντες τὰς τιμὰς τῶν πιπρασκομένων
35 *ἐτίθουν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων·*
διεδίδετο *δὲ* ἐνὶ *ἑκάστῳ,*
καθότι *ἄν τις χρείαν εἶχεν.*
36 *Ἰωσὴφ δὲ ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς* Βαρνάβας *ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων,*
ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον υἱὸς παρακλήσεως,
Λευίτης, Κύπριος *τῷ γένει,*
37 *ὑπάρχοντος αὐτῷ χωρίου,*

31 παντί . . . πιστεύειν (*om.* πιστ. *Aug.*) *DE*, *vg.*aqw, *Iren. Aug. Ephr.* : *om. cett.* 32 καρδία (ἡ καρδ. *E* δ) καὶ (+ ἡ *E* δ) ψυχὴ μία *cett.*, *spec.* : ψυχὴ μία καὶ καρδία μία 𝔖vg, *Aug.* $\frac{12}{15}$ *Hier. alii* : καρδία μία καὶ ψυχὴ μία 𝔈, *Orig.* $\frac{1}{2}$ *Gaud. Aug.* $\frac{1}{15}$ καὶ οὐκ ἦν διάκρισις (χωρισμός *E*) ἐν αὐτοῖς οὐδεμία (τις *E*) *DE*, *Cypr. Ambr.* $\frac{2}{2}$ *Zeno* : *om. cett. Aug.* οὐδείς *D* : οὐδὲ εἷς Γ *E* δ τι *cett.* (𝕷d) : *om. D* : + suum iudicabant *Cypr. Zeno* (οὐδὲ ἓν ἴδιον ἔκρινον *Bl.*) αὐτῷ] αὐτοῦ *D* πάντα *DB* : ἅπαντα ℵ *AE* δ 33 μεγάλῃ δυνάμει *E* δ οἱ ἀπόστ. *ante* τὸ μαρτ. *hab. AE*, *vg.*, *Aug.* τῆς ἀναστ. *post* Ἰησ. *hab. B* τοῦ κυρίου *post* Χριστοῦ *hab.* ℵ *A*, *vg.* : *om.* 𝔖vg Χριστοῦ *DE* ℵ *A*, *vg.*, 𝔖vg : *om. B* δ, 𝕷gpt, 𝔖ph, 𝔈, *Iren. Aug.* 34 ὑπῆρχεν *DE* δ : ἦν Γ, *Eus.* ἦσαν *D* : *om. cett. Orig. Eus. Aug.* οἰκιῶν ℵ, 𝕷d : + ὑπῆρχον *cett.* (*D*) καὶ φέροντες *D* : ἔφερον (et adferebant 𝕷dg) *cett.* τάς *om. D* 35 ἐτίθουν] καὶ ἐτίθουν *codd.* (*D*) : ἐτίθεσάν τε *Eus.* διεδίδετο *D* Γ *E* 614 : διεδίδοτο 383 ἐνί *D* : *om.* Γ *E* δ, *Eus.* 36 Ἰωσῆς δ, 𝔖ph, 𝔈 ὑπό *D* 383 (*m.* 2) : ἀπό Γ *E* 614 Κύπριος Λευίτης *D*

πωλήσας ἤνεγκεν τὸ χρῆμα
καὶ ἔθηκεν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων.

V

1 *Ἀνὴρ δέ τις ὀνόματι Ἀνανίας,*
σὺν Σαφφύρᾳ τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ,
2 *ἐπώλησεν κτῆμα, καὶ ἐνοσφίσατο ἐκ τῆς τιμῆς,*
συνειδυίας καὶ τῆς γυναικός,
καὶ ἐνέγκας μέρος τι
παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔθετο.
3 *εἶπεν δὲ Πέτρος πρὸς Ἀνανίαν·*
Διὰ τί ἐπλήρωσεν ὁ Σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου,
ψεύσασθαί σε τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα,
καὶ νοσφίσασθαι ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ χωρίου;
4 *οὐχὶ μένον σοι ἔμενεν*
καὶ πραθὲν ἐν τῇ σῇ ἐξουσίᾳ ὑπῆρχεν;
τί ὅτι ἔθου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου
ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρὸν τοῦτο;
οὐκ ἐψεύσω ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ.
5 *ἀκούσας δὲ Ἀνανίας τοὺς λόγους τούτους*
παραχρῆμα *πεσὼν ἐξέψυξεν·*
καὶ ἐγένετο φόβος μέγας

37 χωρίου *D*: ἀγροῦ Γ *E* δ   παρὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους *Orig.*   V 1 ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ καιρῷ ἀνήρ τις *E*   ὀνόματι Ἀναν. *DA*, 𝔏^{gt} *vg.*: Ἀναν. ὀνόματι *cett.*   Σαπφείρη *AB* 614   2 ἐκ *D*: ἀπό Γ *E* δ   τιμῆς] +agri *vg.*   συνειδυίας *D* δ: -υίης ℵ *ABE*   καὶ τῆς] τῆς 𝔏^{dgp} *vg.*   ἔθετο *D*: ἔθηκεν Γ *E* δ   3 Πέτρος πρὸς Ἀνανίαν *D*, *vg.*^{w}: πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Π., Ἀνανία *E*, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖: Πέτρος (ὁ Π. ℵ *A*), Ἀνανία *cett.*   ἐπλήρωσεν] ἐπήρωσεν ℵ: ἐπείρασεν *vg.*, *Epiph. alii.*   τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα *D*: τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον Γ *E* δ   καὶ νοσφίσασθαι . . . πονηρὸν τοῦτο] cum esset fundus in tua potestate *Cypr.* (*abbrevians*)   νοσφίσασθαι] +σε *D* 383   4 μένον *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): μέσον *D*   σῇ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): *om.* *D*   ποιῆσαι τὸ (*om.* τό D^1) πονηρὸν τοῦτο *D*, 𝔈: τὸ πρᾶγμα *cett.* (facere dolose rem istam 𝔏^{d}) *Hier.*   ἐψεύσου *D*   5 ἀκούσας δέ *D*: ἀκούων δέ *cett.*: καὶ εὐθέως ἀκούων *E*   Ἀνανίας *D* δ: ὁ Ἀναν. Γ *E*   παραχρῆμα *D*, 𝔏^{p}: *om. cett. Luc.*   πεσών] +ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν 𝔏^{p}, *Bl.*

ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντας.
6 ἀναστάντες δὲ οἱ νεώτεροι συνέστειλαν αὐτὸν
καὶ ἐξενέγκαντες ἔθαψαν.
7 ἐγένετο δὲ ὡς ὡρῶν τριῶν διάστημα,
καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ μὴ εἰδυῖα
τὸ γεγονὸς εἰσῆλθεν.
8 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὴν ὁ Πέτρος· Ἐπερωτήσω σε,
εἰ ἄρα τὸ χωρίον τοσούτου ἀπέδοσθε.
ἡ δὲ εἶπεν, Ναί, τοσούτου.
9 ὁ δὲ Πέτρος πρὸς αὐτήν· Τί ὅτι
συνεφωνήθη ὑμῖν πειράσαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Κυρίου;
ἰδοὺ οἱ πόδες τῶν θαψάντων τὸν ἄνδρα σου
ἐπὶ τῇ θύρᾳ, καὶ ἐξοίσουσίν σε.
10 καὶ ἔπεσεν παραχρῆμα πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐξέψυξεν·
εἰσελθόντες δὲ οἱ νεανίσκοι
εὗρον αὐτὴν νεκράν,
καὶ συστείλαντες ἐξήνεγκαν,
καὶ ἔθαψαν πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς.
11 καὶ ἐγένετο φόβος μέγας
ἐφ᾽ ὅλην τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας
τοὺς ἀκούοντας ταῦτα.

5 ἀκούοντας] +ταῦτα *E* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ 6 ἀναστάντες (ἐλθόντες $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) δέ] +παραχρῆμα *E* ἐξενέγκαντες] euntes $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.* 8 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτήν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: πρὸς ἣν ὁ Πέτρος ἔφη *E*: ἀπεκρίθη δὲ πρὸς αὐτήν *cett. Orig.* ὁ *DE* δ: *om.* Γ ἐπερωτήσω σε *D*: εἰπέ μοι *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) ἄρα *D*: *om.* Γ *E* δ τὸ χωρίον τοσούτου *D*: τοσ. τὸ χωρίον *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) δέ *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$): δή *D* ναὶ τοσούτου] τοσούτου *Luc.*: itaque $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ 9 ὁ δὲ Πέτρος πρὸς (*om.* πρός *D*) αὐτήν *cett.*: ὁ δὲ Π. (+πρὸς αὐτήν $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{E}$) εἶπεν *A* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Π. *E*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. Luc.* συνεφώνησεν *D* τοῦ *D*: *om.* Γ *E* δ, *Orig.* σου] +ἵστανται *E*, $\mathfrak{E}^{vt}$ 10 καὶ ἔπεσεν (ceciditque $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: et ceciditque $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$: ἔπεσεν δέ *cett.* πρός] παρά *E* 614: ἐπί 383 αὐτοῦ] αὐτῶν $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: τοῦ ἀποστόλου $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ συστείλαντες ἐξήνεγκαν καί *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ἐξενέγκαντες *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) 12 ἐν τῷ λαῷ πολλά δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Chr.* ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ *D*, $\mathfrak{E}$ (*cf.* Joh. x. 23): ἐν τῷ ναῷ συνηγμένοι *E*: congregabantur $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett. Luc.* τῇ Σολομ. *D*: Σολομ. Γ *E* δ 13 καὶ οὐδεὶς τῶν λοιπῶν *D*: τῶν δὲ

12 *διὰ δὲ τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγίνετο σημεῖα*
καὶ τέρατα πολλὰ ἐν τῷ λαῷ·
καὶ ἦσαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἅπαντες
ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ *ἐν τῇ στοᾷ τῇ Σολομῶνος·*
13 *καὶ οὐδεὶς τῶν λοιπῶν ἐτόλμα* **κολλᾶσθαι αὐτοῖς·**
ἀλλ' ἐμεγάλυνεν αὐτοὺς ὁ λαός,
14 *μᾶλλον δὲ προσετίθεντο πιστεύοντες*
τῷ Κυρίῳ πλήθη ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ γυναικῶν·
15 *ὥστε κατὰ τὰς πλατείας ἐκφέρειν τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς* **αὐτῶν,**
καὶ τιθέναι ἐπὶ κλιναρίων καὶ κραβάττων
ἵνα ἐρχομένου Πέτρου κἂν ἡ σκία ἐπισκιάσῃ
τινὶ αὐτῶν. **ἀπηλλάσσοντο γὰρ**
ἀπὸ πάσης ἀσθενείας
ἧς εἶχον ἕκαστος αὐτῶν.
16 *συνήρχετο δὲ πλῆθος τῶν πέριξ πόλεων*
εἰς *Ἰερουσαλήμ, φέροντες ἀσθενεῖς*
καὶ ὀχλουμένους ἀπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων·
καὶ ἰῶντο πάντες.
17 *ἀναστὰς δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς*
καὶ πάντες οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ,
ἡ οὖσα αἵρεσις τῶν Σαδδουκαίων,
ἐπλήσθησαν ζήλου,

λοιπῶν οὐδείς *cett. Luc.* 15 κατὰ τὰς (*om.* τάς D^{1}) πλατείας *D* δ, *Chr.*: καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις *E*: καὶ εἰς τὰς πλατείας Γ αὐτῶν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, *Cass.*: *om. cett.* τιθέναι] + ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν *E* κλινῶν *E* δ, *Chr.* σκία] + αὐτοῦ *E*, *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈 ἀπηλλάσσοντο γὰρ (καὶ ἀπηλλ. $\mathfrak{L}^{dp}$) ἀπὸ πάσης ἀσθενείας (+ αὐτῶν $\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$) ἧς (ὡς *D*: quem $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) εἶχεν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: καὶ ἀπηλλάσσοντο (liberantur $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) ἀπ' ἀσθενείας αὐτῶν $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*[a], *Luc.*: καὶ ῥυσθῶσιν ἀπὸ πάσης ἀσθενείας ἧς εἶχον *E*: *om.* Γ δ, *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈 16 διὸ συνήρχετο καί *E* πλῆθος *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.*: καὶ τὸ πλῆθος *cett.* τῶν πέριξ πόλεων] τῶν περὶ πόλεων (finium undique $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *D*: τῶν περιπολίων *Bornemann* εἰς *DE* δ: *om. cett. Luc.* φέροντες] + μεθ' ἑαυτῶν *E* ἀπό *D*: ὑπό Γ *E* δ καὶ ἰῶντο πάντες *D*: οἵτινες ἐθεραπεύοντο ἅπαντες Γ *E* δ (καί *firmant* $\mathfrak{L}^{gpt}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, 𝔈, οἵτινες $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$) 17 ἀναστὰς δὲ (+ Ἄννας *vg.*[a]) ὁ ἀρχιερεύς *cett.*: Ἄννας δὲ ὁ ἀρχ. $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: καὶ ταῦτα βλέπων ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχ. *E* (ὁ δὲ ἀρχ. ἐπλήσθη ζήλου καὶ πάντες οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$)

18 *καὶ ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀποστόλους,*
καὶ ἔθεντο αὐτοὺς ἐν τηρήσει δημοσίᾳ·
καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἷς ἕκαστος εἰς τὰ ἴδια.
19 *τότε διὰ νυκτὸς ἄγγελος* Κυρίου
ἀνέῳξεν τὰς θύρας τῆς φυλακῆς,
20 *ἐξαγαγών τε αὐτοὺς εἶπεν·* Πορεύεσθε
καὶ σταθέντες λαλεῖτε *ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῷ* λαῷ
πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης.
21 *ἀκούσαντες δὲ εἰσῆλθον ὑπὸ τὸν ὄρθρον*
εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἐδίδασκον.
παραγενόμενος δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ,
ἐγερθέντες τὸ πρωΐ,
καὶ συγκαλεσάμενοι τὸ συνέδριον
καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γερουσίαν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ
ἀπέστειλαν εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον ἀχθῆναι αὐτούς.
22 οἱ δὲ *ὑπηρέται παραγενόμενοι*
καὶ ἀνοίξαντες τὴν φυλακὴν
οὐχ εὗρον αὐτοὺς ἔσω·
23 *καὶ ἀναστρέψαντες ἀπήγγειλαν,* λέγοντες
ὅτι Τὸ *δεσμωτήριον εὕρομεν ἐγκεκλεισμένον*
ἐν πάσῃ ἀσφαλείᾳ,

18 χεῖρας] + αὐτῶν *E* δ, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈 δημοσίᾳ *cett.* (𝔏^{g}): *om.* 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Luc.* καὶ . . . ἴδια *D* (*cf.* xiv. 18, xxi. 6: Joh. xvi. 32): *om. cett. Luc. Cass.* 19 τότε διὰ νυκτὸς (per noctem vero 𝔏^{d}) ἄγγελος κυρίου *D*, 𝔖^{vg}: ἀγγ. δὲ κυρίου διὰ (+ τῆς *E* δ, *Chr.*) νυκτός *cett.* (𝔏^{g}): ἀγγ. δὲ κυρίου *Luc.* ἀνέῳξαν *D* 20 καὶ ἐξαγαγών *E* ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ λαλεῖτε 𝔏^{gh}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Luc.* (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ *om. Orig. Bl.*) 21 ἀκούσαντες δέ (+ ταῦτα 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.*) *cett.*: ἐξελθόντες δὲ ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς *E* (*cf. Chr.* 103 b–c): καὶ ἐξῆλθον 𝔖^{vg} ἐδίδασκον] + ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *vg.*^{qw} παραγενόμενοι *B*, 𝔏^{p} οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς 𝔏^{p} ἐγερθέντες τὸ πρωΐ *D*: *om. cett.* (*cf. Ephr.* sacerdotes destiterunt ire stare in templo in precibus mane) συγκαλεσάμενοι *D*: συνεκάλεσαν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) ἀπέστειλαν *Bl.*: καὶ ἀπέστειλαν *codd.* (*D*) τῶν υἱῶν *om.* 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{vg} 22 παραγενόμενοι *post* ὑπηρ. *hab. DE* δ, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph}, *ante* ὑπηρ. Γ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Luc.* καὶ . . . φυλακήν *D*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}: *om. cett. Luc.* ἔσω *D*: ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ *cett. Luc.* 23 καὶ ἀναστρέψαντες 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Luc.*: ἀναστρέψαντες (reversi sunt 𝔏^{d}) καὶ *D*: ἀναστρέψαντες δέ *cett.* τό] + μέν *E* δ, 𝔏^{gh} *vg.*, 𝔈, *Luc.* ἐγκεκλεισμένον *D*: κεκλεισμένον Γ *E* δ ἐπί] πρό *E* δ, *Chr.* οὐδένα ἔσω 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, *Luc.*:

καὶ τοὺς φύλακας ἑστῶτας ἐπὶ τῶν θυρῶν·
ἀνοίξαντες δὲ ἔσω οὐδένα εὕρομεν.
24 ὡς δὲ ἤκουσαν τοὺς λόγους τούτους
ὅ τε στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς,
διηπόρουν περὶ αὐτῶν τί ἂν γένοιτο τοῦτο.
25 παραγενόμενος δέ τις ἀπήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς
ὅτι Ἰδοὺ οἱ ἄνδρες οὓς ἔθεσθε ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ
εἰσὶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἑστῶτες
καὶ διδάσκοντες τὸν λαόν.
26 τότε ἀπελθὼν ὁ στρατηγὸς σὺν τοῖς ὑπηρέταις
ἤγαγον αὐτούς, οὐ μετὰ βίας,
φοβούμενοι τὸν λαὸν μὴ λιθασθῶσιν.
27 ἀγαγόντες δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔστησαν ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ·
28 καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοὺς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς λέγων·
Οὐ παραγγελίᾳ παρηγγείλαμεν ὑμῖν
μὴ διδάσκειν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ;
καὶ ἰδοὺ πεπληρώκατε τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ
τῆς διδαχῆς ὑμῶν,
καὶ βούλεσθε ἐπαγαγεῖν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς
τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου.
29 *ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Πέτρος εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς*

οὐδένα 𝔏^{hp} 24 ὅ τε στρατηγός . . . ἀρχιερεῖς] οἱ ἱερεῖς (ὁ ἱερεύς 𝔖^{ph}) καὶ ὁ στρατ. τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς *E* δ, 𝔖^{ph}: οἱ ἀρχ. καὶ οἱ στρατηγοὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ 𝔖^{vg}: pontifex et princeps sacerdotum 𝔏^{g}: principes et pontifex sacerdotum *Luc.* (*v. l.* ἱερεῖς *turbas dedit*) ἐθαύμαζον καὶ διηπόρουν *E*, *vg.*^{q}, 𝔖^{vg} γένοιτο (γένηται *D*^{1}) τοῦτο (de hoc 𝔏^{d}) *cett.*: θέλοι εἶναι *E* 25 αὐτοῖς] +λέγων 𝔏^{gp}, *Luc.*: (nuntiavit [eis dicens] 𝔏^{h}) ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εἰσιν ἑστῶτες 𝔏^{gp}, *Luc.* 26 στρατηγός] +ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ *E*: +τοῦ ἱεροῦ *vg.*^{q} ἤγαγον *D* (*pluralem tuentur* 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈): ἦγεν (ἤγαγεν *AE* δ) *cett.* οὐ *om.* *D* φοβούμενοι (+γάρ) *D*: φοβούμενος 𝔏^{h}: ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) μήποτε λιθασθῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.* 27 ἔστησαν *om.* 𝔏^{h} ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ] ἐνώπιον τοῦ συνεδρίου 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg} ἐπηρώτησεν . . . λέγων] ἤρξατο . . . πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγειν 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg} ἀρχιερεύς] ἱερεύς *D*^{1}, 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.*: στρατηγός 𝔏^{h} 28 οὐ *om.* Γ, 𝔏^{dg} *vg.*, *Luc.* διδάσκειν *post* τούτῳ *hab.* 𝔏^{h} καὶ ἰδού] ἰδού *D*: ὑμεῖς δὲ ἰδού 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Bl.* ἐφαγαγεῖν *D* (ἐφ' ἡμᾶς *ante* ἐπαγ. *hab.* 𝔏^{h}) ἐκείνου *D*, 𝔏^{ghp}: τούτου *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) 29 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Πέτρος εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς (ad ill . .) 𝔏^{h}: ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Π. καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι εἶπαν (Π. σὺν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις εἶπεν 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{vg}) *cett.* *Luc.*: *om.* *D*

⟨**Τίνι**⟩ πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ, Θεῷ ἢ ἀνθρώποις;
⟨**ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Θεῷ.**⟩
ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς·
30 Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ἤγειρεν Ἰησοῦν,
ὃν ὑμεῖς διεχειρίσασθε κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου·
31 τοῦτον ὁ Θεὸς ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτῆρα
ὕψωσεν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ,
δοῦναι μετάνοιαν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ
καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν **ἐν αὐτῷ**.
32 καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν μάρτυρες
πάντων τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων,
καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, ὃ ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεὸς
τοῖς πειθαρχοῦσιν αὐτῷ.
33 οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες διεπρίοντο
καὶ ἐβουλεύοντο ἀνελεῖν αὐτούς.
34 ἀναστὰς δέ τις ἐκ τοῦ συνεδρίου Φαρισαῖος,
ὀνόματι Γαμαλιήλ, νομοδιδάσκαλος
τίμιος παντὶ τῷ λαῷ,
ἐκέλευσεν τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἔξω βραχὺ ποιῆσαι,
35 εἶπέν τε **πρὸς τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ τοὺς συνεδρίους,**

29 *τίνι* (*εἰ* 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.*) *πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ θεῷ* (+*μᾶλλον Aug.*) *ἢ ἀνθρώποις* 𝔏^{gh}, *Aug.* $\frac{2}{2}$ *Luc.*: *πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ* (an 𝔏^{e}) *ἀνθρώποις cett.* (*D*), *Hipp. Orig. Polycrat.* (*ap. Eus. H.E.* v. 24) ὁ δὲ εἶπεν *θεῷ* 𝔏^{gh}: οἱ δὲ εἶπον *θεῷ vg.*^{a}: *om. cett.* (*D*) ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἶπεν (*ἀπεκρίθη* 𝔏^{d}) πρὸς αὐτούς (-τόν 𝔏^{h}) *D*, 𝔏^{gh}: *om. cett.* 30 *ἤγειρεν*] +*τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ E*, *vg.*^{q} *διεχειρίσασθε*] adprehendistis et interfecistis *Iren.* 31 *ἀρχηγὸν ὁ θεός* 𝔏^{h} *δόξῃ D*, 𝔏^{gp} (𝔏^{h} *exsect.*), 𝔈, *Iren. Aug.*: *δεξιᾷ cett.* *δοῦναι DAE* δ: *τοῦ δοῦναι* ℵ *B* *ἐν αὐτῷ D*, 𝔏^{hp} *vg.*^{q}, 𝔈, *Aug.*: *om. cett. Iren.* 32 *ἐσμεν μάρτυρες* (ipsi testes sumus 𝔏^{d}) *cett.*: *ἐν αὐτῷ μάρτ. B*, *Iren.*: *ἐσμεν αὐτοῦ μάρτ. E* 383, 𝔏^{p}: *μὲν μάρτ. ἐσμεν* 𝔏^{h} *πάντων D*, 𝔏^{hp}: *om. cett. Iren.* *τῶν ῥημάτων om.* 𝔏^{p}, *del. Bl.* *καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου* 𝔏^{h} *ὃ*] *ὃν DE*: *om. B* 33 *ἀκούσαντες*] +*ταῦτα E*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, *Luc.*: +*τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα* 614, 𝔏^{hp}, 𝔖, *Bl.* *ἐβούλοντο ABE* δ, 𝔈 34 *ἐκ τοῦ συνεδρίου φαρισαῖος* (-*αίων* 𝔏^{p}) *DE*, 𝔏^{hp}: *ἐκ τῶν φαρισαίων* 𝔖^{vg}: *ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ φαρισαῖος cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Cass.* *καὶ τίμιος* 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖 *τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἔξω βραχὺ ποιῆσαι D*, 𝔖, 𝔈: *ἔξω βραχὺ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους* (*ἀποστόλους E* δ) *ποιῆσαι cett.* (pusillum apostolos foras secedere 𝔏^{g}, apostolos mi[. . . . .]uci interim foras 𝔏^{h}) 35 *πρός . . . τοὺς συνεδρίους* (concilium 𝔏^{d}) *D*,

Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται, προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς
ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις,
τί μέλλετε πράσσειν.
36 πρὸ γὰρ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν
ἀνέστη Ἰούδας ὁ Γαλιλαῖος
ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀπογραφῆς,
ᾧ προσεκλίθη ἀριθμὸς ἀνδρῶν
ὡς τετρακοσίων,
ὃς κατελύθη **αὐτὸς δι' αὐτοῦ**
καὶ πάντες ὅσοι ἐπείθοντο αὐτῷ
διελύθησαν
καὶ ἐγένοντο εἰς οὐδέν.
37 μετὰ τοῦτον ἀνέστη Θευδᾶς, λέγων
εἶναί τινα **μέγαν** ἑαυτόν,
καὶ ἀπέστησεν λαὸν **πολὺν** ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ·
κἀκεῖνος ἀπώλετο καὶ ὅσοι ἐπείθοντο αὐτῷ
διεσκορπίσθησαν.
38 καὶ τὰ νῦν, **ἀδελφοί**, λέγω ὑμῖν
ἀπόστητε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτων
καὶ ἐάσατε αὐτοὺς
μὴ μιάναντες τὰς χεῖρας·

𝔈^{vg}: πρὸς ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον 𝔏^{h}: πρὸς τοὺς συνεδρίους 𝔈^{vt}: πρὸς αὐτούς *cett.* ἑαυτοῖς *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): ἑαυτούς *D* ἐπί . . . τούτοις] ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτων *E*, 𝔏^{gp} τί *ante* ἐπί *hab.* 𝔏^{h} 36–7 *vocc.* Θευδᾶς . . . ἑαυτόν *et* Ἰούδας . . . ἀπογραφῆς *inter se transposui* 36 ᾧ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): ᾧ καί *D* προσεκλίθη ℵ *AB*: προσεκλήθη *DCE*: προσεκληρώθη 383: προσεκολλήθη 614 ἀριθμός *ante* ἀνδρῶν *hab.* *D* δ, 𝔏^{ghp} *vg.*, *post* ἀνδρ. Γ *E*, *om.* 𝔈 κατελύθη *Eus. Bl.*: διελύθη *D*, 𝔏^{p}: ἀνῃρέθη *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) αὐτὸς δι' αὐτοῦ *D*: *om. cett.* (𝔏^{d}) *Eus.* ἐπίθοντο *D*: *ita mox* διελύθησαν (διεσκορπίσθησαν 614, διεσκεδάσθησαν *Orig.*) *cett. Orig. Eus.*: *om.* *D* καὶ ἐγένοντο *om.* 𝔏^{p} 37 μετὰ τοῦτον) + deinde 𝔏^{h} Θευδᾶς] + τις 𝔏^{h}: + μάγος *vg.*^{w} μέγαν *DAE* 614, 𝔏^{gh}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Orig. Hier.*: *om. cett. Eus.* λαὸν πολύν *DC*: ἱκανὸν λαόν *A*^{2} *E* δ: πολύν (ἱκανόν) *firmant* 𝔏^{ghp}, 𝔖: λαόν ℵ *A*^{1} *B*, 𝔏^{d} *vg.*, 𝔈, *Eus.* ἀπώλετο] διελύθη 𝔏^{p} ὅσοι *D*, 𝔏^{ghp}: πάντες ὅσοι *cett. Eus.* 38 καὶ τὰ νῦν (καὶ νῦν *BE*) *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): + εἰσιν *D*: nunc autem 𝔏^{h} ἀδελφοί *D*, 𝔏^{h}: *om. cett.* ἀπόστητε *post* τούτων *hab.* 𝔏^{h} ἐάσατε *DE* δ: ἄφετε Γ μὴ μιάναντες (μολύνοντες *E*) τὰς χεῖρας (+ ὑμῶν *E*, 𝔏^{h}) *DE*, 𝔏^{h}: *om. cett.*

ὅτι ἐὰν ᾖ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἡ βουλὴ αὕτη
ἢ τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο, καταλυθήσεται
⟨**ἡ δύναμις αὐτῆς**⟩·
39 εἰ δὲ ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐστίν, οὐ δυνήσεσθε καταλῦσαι αὐτοὺς
οὔτε ὑμεῖς οὔτε βασιλεῖς οὔτε τύραννοι·
ἀπέχεσθε οὖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτων
μήποτε καὶ θεόμαχοι εὑρεθῆτε.
40 ἐπείσθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ,
καὶ προσκαλεσάμενοι τοὺς ἀποστόλους
δείραντες παρήγγειλαν
μὴ λαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ,
καὶ ἀπέλυσαν **αὐτούς.**
41 οἱ μὲν οὖν **ἀπόστολοι** ἐπορεύοντο χαίροντες
ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ συνεδρίου,
ὅτι ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος κατηξιώθησαν
42 ἀτιμασθῆναι· πᾶσάν τε ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ
καὶ κατ᾽ οἶκον οὐκ ἐπαύοντο διδάσκοντες
καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

VI

1 Ἐν δὲ ταύταις ταῖς ἡμέραις

38 ᾖ . . . αὕτη] αὕτη ἡ ἐξουσία ἀνθρωπίνου θελήματος ᾖ 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.* ἡ δύναμις αὐτῆς 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.*: *om. cett.* (*D*). 39 εἰ δέ . . . ἐστιν] εἰ δὲ αὕτη ἡ ἐξουσία ἐκ θεοῦ θελήματός ἐστιν 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.* οὔτε . . . τύραννοι *D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{ph}: οὔτε ὑμεῖς οὔτε οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν *E*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{aw}: οὔτε τύραννοι ὑμῶν 𝔈^{vt}: *om. cett. Orig.* ἀπέχεσθε (ἀπόσχεσθε 614) . . . ἀνθρώπων (ἀνδρῶν 614) τούτων *D* 614, 𝔏^{h} *vg.*^{w}, 𝔖^{ph}: *om. cett. Orig.* καί *om. D* 40 ἐπείσθησαν] επειστ || || ες *D* δέ] οὖν 𝔏^{dgh} δείραντες] + ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς *hoc loco* (*sine* καί) 𝔏^{gh}, *Luc. Bl.* παραγγείλαντες 𝔏^{gh}, *Luc. Bl.* μή] ne umquam 𝔏^{h}, μηδέποτε *Bl.* λαλεῖν] + τινι 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.* Ἰησοῦ] + μηδενὶ ἀνθρώπων 𝔏^{g} καὶ ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς (*om.* αὐτούς Γ) *cett.* (*D*): *om.* 𝔏^{gh}, *Luc. Bl.* 41 ἀπόστολοι *D* 614, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Ambst.*: *om. cett.* (𝔏^{h} *exsect.*) ἐπορεύοντο] ἀπολυθέντες ἐπορεύοντο 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.* ὀνόματος *D* Γ, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Luc.*: + τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ *E* δ, 𝔖^{ph}: + τοῦ Ἰησοῦ 𝔏^{gh} *vg.*: + τοῦ Χριστοῦ 𝔏^{p} κατηξιώθησαν *ante* ὑπέρ *hab.* Γ, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Orig. Eus. Ambst.* 42 τε *cett.* (*E*) *Iren.*: δέ *D*, 𝔏^{egh} τὸν κύριον (+ ἡμῶν *Luc.*) Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν (*om.* Χριστόν *C*) *DC*, 𝔏^{ghp}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Luc.*: τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησ. Γ 614, *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}: Ἰησ. (+ τόν 383) Χριστόν *E* 383: τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησ. τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ *Iren.* VI 1 ταύταις ταῖς ἡμέραις *D*, 𝔏^{g}: ταῖς ἡμ. ταύταις *cett.* (𝔏^{d})

πληθυνόντων τῶν μαθητῶν
ἐγένετο γογγυσμὸς τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν
πρὸς τοὺς Ἑβραίους,
ὅτι παρεθεωροῦντο ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ
τῇ καθημερίνῃ αἱ χῆραι αὐτῶν
ὑπὸ τῶν διακόνων τῶν Ἑβραίων.
2 προσκαλεσάμενοι δὲ οἱ δώδεκα
τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν εἶπαν **πρὸς αὐτούς·**
Οὐκ ἀρεστόν ἐστιν ἡμῖν
καταλείψαντας τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ
διακονεῖν τραπέζαις.
3 **τί οὖν ἐστιν, ἀδελφοί;**
ἐπισκέψασθε ἐξ ὑμῶν **αὐτῶν**
ἄνδρας μαρτυρουμένους ἑπτὰ
πλήρεις Πνεύματος καὶ σοφίας,
οὓς καταστήσομεν ἐπὶ τῆς χρείας ταύτης.
4 ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐσόμεθα τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ διακονίᾳ
τοῦ λόγου προσκαρτεροῦντες.
5 καὶ ἤρεσεν ὁ λόγος **οὗτος** ἐνώπιον παντὸς
τοῦ πλήθους **τῶν μαθητῶν,**

πληθυνόντων] πληθύνοντος τοῦ ὄχλου 𝔏^{h} παρεθεωροῦντο *cett.* (*D*): discupiuntur 𝔏^{d}: despicerentur 𝔏^{h} *sec. Berg.*, discupierentur *sec. Buch.* τῇ *ante* καθημ. *om. D* αὐτῶν] τῶν Ἑλλήνων 𝔏^{h} ὑπὸ τῶν διακόνων 𝔏^{h}: ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ *D*: *om. cett.* τῶν Ἑβραίων *D*, 𝔏^{h}: *om. cett.* 2 δέ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): *om. D* δώδεκα] ἀπόστολοι 𝔏^{g}: δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{aw} ὅλον τὸ πλῆθος 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Cypr. Bl.* πρὸς αὐτούς (eis 𝔏^{h}, *Cypr.*) *D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Cypr.*: *om. cett.* οὐκ (+enim 𝔏^{d}) ἀρεστόν ἐστιν] non est aequum 𝔏^{h} *vg.*: non est dignum *Hier.* ½: non oportet 𝔈, *Hier.* ½ ἡμῖν (ὑμῖν 𝔏^{h})*DC*, 𝔏^{ghp}: ἡμᾶς *cett. Clem.* καταλιπόντας *E* 614, *Chr.* 3 τί οὖν . . . ἐπισκέψασθε (+itaque 𝔏^{d}) *D*, 𝔏^{hp}: ἐπισκέψασθε (-ψώμεθα *B*) δὲ (οὖν *CE* δ, 𝔏^{gt} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}) ἀδελφοί *cett.* αὐτῶν *D*, 𝔏^{ghpt}: *om. cett.* πλήρης *AE*, *cf. v.* 5 (πλήρεις . . . σοφίας *om. Ambst.*) πνεύματος] +ἁγίου *ACE* 383, 𝔏^{ht} *vg.*, *Hier.*: +τοῦ κυρίου 𝔖^{vg} (plenos spiritu sapientiae eos qui credunt 𝔖^{ph}) σοφίας] +τοῦ κυρίου 𝔏^{h} ταύτης] αὐτῆς *D* 4 ἐσόμεθα (sumus 𝔏^{d}) *D*, 𝔏^{ghpt}, *Hier.*: *om. cett.* καὶ τῇ διακονίᾳ *om.* 𝔏^{h} προσκαρτεροῦντες *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{ghp}: προσκαρτερήσομεν (-σωμεν *E*, 383, perseveramus 𝔏^{d}) *cett.* 5 οὗτος *D*, 𝔏^{ght}, 𝔖, 𝔈: *om. cett.* παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους] o . . . . . 𝔏^{h}: πάντων *Bl.* τῶν μαθητῶν *D*, 𝔏^{h}: *om. cett.*

καὶ ἐξελέξαντο Στέφανον, ἄνδρα πλήρης πίστεως
καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου,
καὶ Φίλιππον καὶ Πρόχορον,
καὶ Νικάνορα καὶ Τίμωνα,
καὶ Παρμενᾶν καὶ Νικόλαον
προσήλυτον Ἀντιοχέα·
6 οὗτοι ἐστάθησαν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀποστόλων,
οἵτινες προσευξάμενοι
ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας.
7 καὶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου ηὔξανεν, καὶ ἐπληθύνετο
ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν μαθητῶν
ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ σφόδρα,
πολύς τε ὄχλος τῶν ἱερέων ὑπήκουον τῇ πίστει.
8 Στέφανος δὲ πλήρης χάριτος καὶ δυνάμεως
ἐποίει τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα μεγάλα ἐν τῷ λαῷ
διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
9 ἀνέστησαν δέ τινες ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς
λεγομένης Λιβερτίνων,
καὶ Κυρηναίων καὶ Ἀλεξανδρέων
καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας
καὶ Ἀσίας
συνζητοῦντες τῷ Στεφάνῳ,

5 ἄνδρα *om.* 𝕷^{p} πλήρης *D* ℵ *ACE* 614: πλήρη *BC*^{2} 383 (*voc. haud raro indeclinabile est, cf. ad v.* 3) Πρόχωρον *E*: Proculum 𝕷^{h} Σίμωνα 𝕷^{h} 6 οὗτοι ἐστάθησαν *D*, 𝕷^{p}, 𝕾^{vg}: οὓς (hos 𝕷^{h}) ἔστησαν *cett.* (𝕷^{h}) οἵτινες *D*: καί *cett.* (𝕷^{d}) 7 κυρίου *DE* 614, 𝕷^{hp} *vg.*, 𝕾^{ph}: θεοῦ *cett. Aug.* μαθητῶν] μανθανόντων (discentium 𝕷^{e}) *E* ἐν Ἱερουσ. *om.* 𝕷^{h} τε] δέ 𝕷^{hp} τῶν ἱερέων] ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ 𝕷^{h}: τῶν Ἰουδαίων ℵ, 𝕾^{vg} ὑπήκουον *D* ℵ *B* 383, 𝕷^{h}: ὑπήκουεν (-σεν 614) *cett.* πίστει] + τοῦ εὐαγγελίου *c.Th.* 8 χάριτος] πίστεως 383, 𝕾^{ph}, *Chr.*: χάριτος καὶ πίστεως *E* δυνάμεως] πνεύματος ἁγίου *Aug.* σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα *E*, 𝕷^{g}, 𝕾, *Gaud. Cass.* μεγάλα *om.* 𝕷^{h}, 𝕾^{vg} διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι *E*, 𝕷^{gh}) τοῦ (*om.* τοῦ *D*) κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (*om.* τοῦ κυρ. 𝕷^{h}: *om.* Ἰησ. Χριστοῦ 𝕾^{ph}) *D* 614, 𝕷^{ghpt}, 𝕾^{ph}, 𝕰, *Aug. Gaud. Ado*: *om.* Γ 383, *vg.*, 𝕾^{vg} 9 ἐξανέστησαν 614, 𝕷^{gp} τῶν λεγομένων ℵ *A*, 𝕷^{g}, 𝕰 καὶ Κυρηναίων . . . Κιλικίας] et alii Cyrenaei et ab Alexan[dria e]t Cilicia 𝕷^{h} καὶ Ἀσίας *om.* *D*^{1} *A* 10 οἵτινες *D*, 𝕷^{ht}: καί *cett.* τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ *DE*, 𝕷^{h}: ἐν αὐτῷ *post* ἐλάλει *Hier.*: *om. cett.* τῷ ἁγίῳ *DE*, 𝕷^{ghpt}, *Ado*: *om. cett.*

10 *οἵτινες οὐκ ἴσχυον ἀντιστῆναι τῇ σοφίᾳ*
τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ *καὶ τῷ Πνεύματι* **τῷ Ἁγίῳ** *ᾧ*
ἐλάλει,
διὰ τὸ ἐλέγχεσθαι αὐτοὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ
μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας.
11 **μὴ δυνάμενοι οὖν ἀντοφθαλμεῖν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ,**
τότε ὑπέβαλον ἄνδρας λέγοντας
ὅτι Ἀκηκόαμεν αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος
ῥήματα βλασφημίας εἰς Μωσῆν καὶ τὸν Θεόν.
12 *συνεκίνησάν τε τὸν λαὸν*
καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους καὶ τοὺς γραμματεῖς,
καὶ ἐπιστάντες συνήρπασαν αὐτὸν
καὶ ἤγαγον εἰς τὸ συνέδριον,
13 *καὶ ἔστησαν μάρτυρας ψευδεῖς*
κατὰ αὐτοῦ *λέγοντας·*
Ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος οὐ παύεται ῥήματα λαλῶν
κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ τοῦ νόμου.
14 *ἀκηκόαμεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος*
ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος οὗτος
καταλύσει τὸν τόπον τοῦτον καὶ ἀλλάξει τὰ ἔθη
ἃ παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν Μωσῆς.
15 *ἠτένιζον δὲ αὐτῷ πάντες*

Hier. ᾧ] ὅ 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Hier.* διὰ τὸ ἐλέγχεσθαι αὐτοὺς (διότι ἠλέγχοντο *E*) ὑπ' (ἐπ' *D*) αὐτοῦ . . . παρρησίας *D c.Th. E*, 𝔏^{ht} *vg.*$^{aw, boh}$ (*cf. Ephr.*): *om. cett.* 11 μὴ δυνάμενοι · . . ἀληθείᾳ *D c.Th.*: tunc itaque non valen[tes res]istere adversus veritatem 𝔏^{h}: ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἐδύναντο ἀντιλέγειν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ *E*, 𝔏^{t} *vg.*$^{w, boh}$ (*cf. Ephr.*): *om. cett.* (*vg.*^{a}) βλασφημίας *D* 614, 𝔏^{ghpt} *vg.*, 𝔖: βλάσφημα *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) 12 καὶ ταῦτα εἰπόντες συνεκίνησάν τε *E* καὶ ἐπιστάντες] *om.* καί 𝔏^{h}: *om.* ἐπίσταντες ℵ ἤγαγον] +αὐτόν *A*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, 𝔈 13 καὶ ἔστησαν *D*: ἔστησάν τε Γ *E* δ κατὰ αὐτοῦ *D*, 𝔏^{h}: *om. cett.* ὁ ἄνθρωπος . . . παύεται] non . . . cit homo iste 𝔏^{h} ῥήματα λαλῶν (iacere 𝔏^{h}) *DA*, 𝔏^{h}: λαλῶν ῥήματα ℵ *BC*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔖: ῥήματα βλάσφημα (-μίας 𝔏^{t}, *Cass.*) λαλῶν *E* δ, 𝔏^{t}, *Cass.* κατὰ τοῦ νόμου καὶ κατὰ τούτου τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου 𝔏^{ht}, 𝔖^{vg} 14 γάρ] δέ 𝔏^{h} οὗτος *om.* 𝔏^{h}, *Aug.* τὸν τόπον] τὸ ἱερόν 𝔏^{h}, *Aug.* τὰ ἔθη] instar 𝔏^{g}: iterum 𝔏^{d} 15 καὶ (*del. Bl.*) ἠτένιζον δὲ αὐτῷ *D*: καὶ ἀτενίσαντες εἰς αὐτόν *cett.* (𝔏^{d})

οἱ καθήμενοι ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ,
καὶ εἶδον τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ
ὡσεὶ πρόσωπον ἀγγέλου
ἑστῶτος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν.

VII

1 Εἶπεν δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς **τῷ Στεφάνῳ**·
2 Εἰ **ἄρα** ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχει; ὁ δὲ ἔφη·
Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, ἀκούσατε.
ὁ Θεὸς τῆς δόξης ὤφθη τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν
Ἀβραάμ, ὄντι ἐν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ,
πρὶν ἢ κατοικῆσαι αὐτὸν
3 ἐν Χαρράν, καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν·
Ἔξελθε ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ τῆς συγγενείας σου,
καὶ δεῦρο εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν ἄν σοι δείξω.
4 τότε **Ἀβραὰμ** ἐξελθὼν ἐκ γῆς Χαλδαίων
κατῴκησεν ἐν Χαρράν,
κἀκεῖ ἦν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ,
καὶ μετῴκισεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν γῆν ταύτην
εἰς ἣν ὑμεῖς νῦν κατοικεῖτε,
καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν·
5 καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κληρονομίαν ἐν αὐτῇ,
οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδός,

15 *καθήμενοι* *D* 614: *καθεζόμενοι* Γ *E* 383 *καὶ εἶδον* *D*: *εἶδον* *cett.* ἀγγέλου] + τοῦ θεοῦ $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ ἑστῶτος . . . αὐτῶν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{ht}$: *om. cett.* VII 1 εἶπεν δέ] *καὶ ἠρώτησεν* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Bl.* τῷ Στεφάνῳ *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ *vg.*^{aqw}: τὸν Στέφανον $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Bl.*: *αὐτῷ* 𝔈: *om. cett.* *ἄρα* *DE* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) ταῦτα *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$): τοῦτο *D* ἔχει] haberent $\mathfrak{L}^{ghp}$ 2 ἔφη] ἀπεκρίθη $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Bl.*: ἀποκριθεὶς ἔφη 𝔈 ὄντι . . . Χαρράν *om. Iren.* πρίν . . . αὐτόν *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{p1}$: postea quam mortuus esset $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ Χαρράν] + postquam (antequam $\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$) mortuus est pater ipsius $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: + priusquam mortuus est pater eius $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ 3 ἀπό *D*: ἐκ Γ *E* δ, *Orig.* καί *DB*: καὶ ἐκ *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$), *Iren.* συγγενείας σου] + καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρός σου *E*, *vg.*^{a}, *Aug.* εἰς] ει εις *D*, *cf.* I. 6 4 τότε . . . ἐν Χαρράν *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: τότε . . . πατέρα αὐτοῦ *om. Iren.* Ἀβραάμ *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.* ἐξῆλθεν $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ κατῴκησεν] καὶ κατῴκησεν *D* κἀκεῖ ἦν *D*: κἀκεῖθεν *cett. Aug.* μετὰ τό . . . αὐτοῦ *cett. Aug. Hier.*: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{gp1}$ καί *D*, *Iren.*: *om. cett.*

ἀλλ᾽ ἐπηγγείλατο δοῦναι αὐτῷ
εἰς κατάσχεσιν αὐτὴν καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ
μετ᾽ αὐτόν, οὐκ ὄντος αὐτῷ τέκνου.
6 ἐλάλησεν δὲ οὕτως ὁ Θεὸς πρὸς αὐτόν,
ὅτι ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ πάροικον
ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ, καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτοὺς
καὶ κακώσουσιν ἔτη τέτρακόσια.
7 καὶ τὸ ἔθνος ᾧ ἂν δουλεύσουσιν
κρινῶ ἐγώ, εἶπεν ὁ Θεός,
καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξελεύσονται
καὶ λατρεύσουσίν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ.
8 καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ διαθήκην περιτομῆς·
καὶ οὕτως ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰσαὰκ
καὶ περιέτεμεν αὐτὸν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ·
καὶ ὁ Ἰσαὰκ τὸν Ἰακώβ,
καὶ Ἰακὼβ τοὺς δώδεκα πατριάρχας.
9 καὶ οἱ πατριάρχαι ζηλώσαντες τὸν Ἰωσὴφ
ἀπέδοντο εἰς Αἴγυπτον·
καὶ ἦν ὁ Θεὸς μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ,
10 καὶ ἐξείλατο αὐτὸν ἐκ πασῶν τῶν θλίψεων αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ χάριν καὶ σοφίαν
ἐναντίον Φαραὼ βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου,
καὶ κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ἡγούμενον ἐπ᾽ Αἴγυπτον
καὶ ὅλον τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.

μετῴκησεν DE δ   αὐτόν] + ὁ θεός *E*, 𝔖^{vg} καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν (ὑμῶν 𝔖^{ph}) οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν (ὑμῶν 𝔖^{ph}) *D*, 𝔖^{ph} : καὶ οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν *E*, *Aug.* : *om. cett. Iren. Hier.* (coepit repetere illis ab Abraham cum ceteris patriarchis *Ephr.*)   5 ἐν αὐτῇ *ante* κληρον. *hab. E*, *om. Hier.*   ἀλλ᾽ *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔈, *Iren.* : καί *cett.*   αὐτῷ εἰς κατάσχ. αὐτήν *DBC*, *Iren.* : αὐτὴν εἰς κατάσχ. αὐτῷ ℵ *AE* : αὐτῷ αὐτὴν (αὐτὴν αὐτῷ) εἰς κατάσχ. *cett.*   οὐκ . . . τέκνου *om. Iren.*   6 πρὸς αὐτόν *D*, *Iren.* : αὐτῷ ℵ 383, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : *om. ABC* 614, 𝔖^{ph} αὐτοῦ] σου ℵ, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈   κακώσουσιν . . . δουλώσουσιν *E* (in servitutem redigentur et vexabuntur *Iren.*)   αὐτούς *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔈 : αὐτό *cett.*   7 εἶπεν ὁ θεός (κύριος 𝔏^{dgp} *vg.*, *Iren.*) *DE* δ, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔖, *Iren.* : ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν Γ   ἐξελεύσονται] + ἐκεῖθεν *E*   8 ὁ Ἰσαάκ *D* δ : Ἰσαάκ Γ *E* (*post* Ἰσαάκ *add.* ἐγέννησεν *E*), 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{vg} ὁ Ἰακώβ δ (+ ἐγέννησεν 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{vg})   10 αὐτῷ χάριν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : χάριν αὐτῷ *D* : χάριν *A*   Φαραώ *om.* 614   ἡγούμενον *om.* 𝔏^{d} ὅλον] ἐφ᾽ ὅλον ℵ *ACE*, *vg.*, 𝔖

11 ἦλθεν δὲ λιμὸς ἐφ' ὅλης τῆς Αἰγύπτου
καὶ Χαναάν, καὶ θλῖψις μεγάλη,
καὶ οὐχ εὕρισκον χορτάσματα οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν.
12 ἀκούσας οὖν Ἰακὼβ ὄντα σιτία ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ
ἐξαπέστειλεν τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν πρῶτον·
13 καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ δευτέρῳ
ἀνεγνωρίσθη Ἰωσὴφ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ,
καὶ φανερὸν ἐγενήθη
τῷ Φαραὼ τὸ γένος τοῦ Ἰωσήφ.
14 ἀποστείλας δὲ Ἰωσὴφ
μετεκαλέσατο Ἰακὼβ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ,
καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν συγγένειαν αὐτοῦ,
ἐν ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ πέντε ψυχαῖς.
15 καὶ κατέβη Ἰακὼβ εἰς Αἴγυπτον,
καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν αὐτός τε καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν·
16 καὶ μετήχθησαν εἰς Συχὲμ
καὶ ἐτέθησαν ἐν τῷ μνήματι
ᾧ ὠνήσατο Ἀβραὰμ τιμῆς ἀργυρίου
παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἐμμὼρ ἐν Συχέμ.
17 καθὼς δὲ ἤγγιζεν ὁ χρόνος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας
ἧς ἐπηγγείλατο ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Ἀβραάμ,
ηὔξησεν ὁ λαὸς καὶ ἐπληθύνθη ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ,
18 ἄχρι οὗ ἀνέστη βασιλεὺς ἕτερος

11 ἐφ' ὅλης *D* : ἐφ' ὅλην Γ *E* δ   τῆς Αἰγύπτου *D* : τὴν Αἴγυπτον Γ : τὴν γῆν Αἰγύπτου *E* δ, 𝔏^{dgp}, 𝔖   12 οὖν *D*, 𝔏^{g} : δέ *cett.* (𝔏^{d})   ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ *D* δ : εἰς Αἴγυπτον Γ *E*   13 ἐπί *D* : ἐν Γ *E* δ   ἐγνωρίσθη *AB*   ἐγενήθη *D* : ἐγένετο Γ *E* δ   τοῦ Ιωσήφ] αὐτοῦ ℵ *AE*, *vg.*   14 ἀποστείλας δὲ Ἰωσήφ *om.* 614   Ἰακώβ *post* αὐτοῦ *hab.* δ, 𝔖 : *om.* 𝔏^{p} συγγένειαν αὐτοῦ *DE*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈 : συγγένειαν Γ δ   ἐν ἑβδομήκοντα . . . ψυχαῖς *D* 614, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖, *Hier.* : ἐν ψυχαῖς ἑβδ. πέντε Γ *E* 383, *vg.*   15 καὶ κατέβη ℵ *ACE*, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} : κατέβη *D*, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Hier.* : κατέβη δέ *B* δ   εἰς Αἴγυπτον *om.* *B*   ἐτελεύτησεν] + ἐκεῖ *E*, 𝔖^{vg} τε καί *D* : καί Γ *E* δ   16 μετήχθησαν *D* : μετετέθησαν Γ *E* δ   καὶ ἐτέθησαν . . . Συχέμ *om.* 𝔏^{g} ᾧ] ὅ δ, *Chr.*   Ἀβραάμ] + ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν *E*, 𝔏^{p} ἐν (τοῦ ἐν *AE*) Συχέμ Γ *E*, 𝔈 : τοῦ Συχέμ (et Sychem 𝔏^{d}) *D* δ, 𝔏^{p} *vg.* : τοῦ ἐκ Συχέμ 𝔖^{ph} : patris Sychem *Hier.* : *om.* 𝔖^{vg} 17 ἐπηγγείλατο *D c.Th.* *E*, 𝔏^{p} : ὡμολόγησεν Γ, *vg.*, 𝔈 : ὤμοσεν δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph} (pollicitus fuerat iuramento 𝔖^{vg})   ὁ θεός *om.* 𝔏^{p} 18 ἄχρι *DBC* : ἄχρις ℵ *AE* δ   ἕτερος *DE* δ, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{ph} :

ὃς οὐκ ἐμνήσθη τοῦ Ἰωσήφ.
19 *καὶ κατασοφισάμενος τὸ γένος ἡμῶν*
ἐκάκωσεν τοὺς πατέρας,
τοῦ ποιεῖν ἔκθετα τὰ βρέφη αὐτῶν,
εἰς τὸ μὴ ζωογονεῖσθαι.
20 *ἐν ᾧ καιρῷ ἐγεννήθη* Μωσῆς,
καὶ ἦν ἀστεῖος τῷ Θεῷ·
ὃς ἀνετράφη μῆνας τρεῖς
ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρὸς **αὐτοῦ**·
21 *ἐκτεθέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ* **παρὰ τὸν ποταμὸν**
ἀνείλατο αὐτὸν ἡ θυγατὴρ Φαραώ,
καὶ ἀνεθρέψατο ἑαυτῇ εἰς υἱόν.
22 *καὶ ἐπαιδεύθη* Μωσῆς *πᾶσαν τὴν σοφίαν* Αἰγυπτίων,
ἦν τε δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις αὐτοῦ.
23 *ὡς δὲ ἐπληροῦτο τεσσερακονταετὴς αὐτῷ χρόνος,*
ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ
ἐπισκέψασθαι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ
τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ.
24 *καὶ ἰδών τινα ἀδικούμενον* **ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ**
ἠμύνατο καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐκδίκησιν
τῷ καταπονουμένῳ πατάξας τὸν Αἰγύπτιον,
καὶ ἔκρυψεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἄμμῳ.
25 *ἐνόμιζεν δὲ συνιέναι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς* **αὐτοῦ**,

ἕτερος ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον *cett.* (*c.Th.*) ἐμνήσθη τοῦ *DE*, 𝔏^{gp}: ᾔδει τόν *cett.* 19 καί (*om.* 𝔏^{d}) *D*: οὗτος *cett.* πατέρας] + ἡμῶν *ACE* δ, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔖 (ἐκάκωσεν τοὺς πατ. *om.* 𝔈^{vt}) ἔκθετα *ante* τὰ βρέφη *hab.* *DE* δ, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}: *post* βρέφη Γ ζωογονεῖσθαι] + τὰ ἄρρενα *E*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{a} 20 αὐτοῦ] μου ℵ: *om.* *ABC* 614, *Chr.* 21 ἐκτεθέντα δὲ αὐτόν *E* δ, *Chr.* παρὰ (εἰς *E*) τὸν ποταμόν *DE*, *vg.*^{aw}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Arm.*^{cat}: *om. cett.* καί *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): *om. D* ἑαυτῇ] αὐτῇ *D*: αὐτὸν ἑαυτῇ (αὐτῇ *E*) *cett.* 22 πᾶσαν τὴν σοφίαν *D*, *Clem. Ambst.* ½: ἐν (*om.* ἐν *B*, *Orig. alii*) πάσῃ σοφίᾳ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Orig. Ambr. Ambst.* ½ *Aug.* τε *DE*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈: δέ *cett.* (𝔏^{e}) ἔργοις] ἐν ἔργοις *E*, *vg.*, 𝔖 αὐτοῦ *om.* δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* 23 τεσσ. αὐτῷ *D*: αὐτῷ τεσσ. *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) ἀνέβη . . αὐτοῦ *om.* 𝔏^{p} τοῦ ἐπισκέψασθαι *E* 383 24 ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ (*om.* αὐτοῦ *D*: suo 𝔏^{d}) *DE*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖: *om. cett.* ἠμύνατο Γ *E* δ: ἠμύνετο *D* καὶ ἔκρ. . . . ἄμμῳ *D*, *vg.*^{w}: *om. cett.* 25 αὐτοῦ *om.* ℵ *BC*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*: + τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ *c.Th.*, *vg.*^{w}, 𝔖^{vg} (*ex v.* 23)

ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς διὰ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ δίδωσι σωτηρίαν αὐτοῖς·
οἱ δὲ οὐ συνῆκαν.
26 τότε ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ ὤφθη αὐτοῖς μαχομένοις
καὶ εἶδεν αὐτοὺς ἀδικοῦντας,
καὶ συνήλλασσεν αὐτοὺς εἰς εἰρήνην εἰπών·
Τί ποιεῖτε, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί,
ἱνατί ἀδικεῖτε **εἰς** ἀλλήλους;
27 ὁ δὲ ἀδικῶν τὸν πλησίον
ἀπώσατο αὐτὸν εἴπας·
Τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα
καὶ δικάστην ἐφ' ἡμᾶς;
28 μὴ ἀνελεῖν με σὺ θέλεις,
ὃν τρόπον ἀνεῖλες ἐχθὲς τὸν Αἰγύπτιον;
29 **οὕτως καὶ** ἐφυγάδευσεν Μωσῆς
ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ,
καὶ ἐγένετο πάροικος ἐν γῇ Μαδιάμ,
οὗ ἐγέννησεν υἱοὺς δύο.
30 καὶ **μετὰ ταῦτα** πλησθέντων **αὐτῷ** ἐτῶν τεσσεράκοντα
ὤφθη αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τοῦ ὄρους Σινᾶ
ἄγγελος **Κυρίου** ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς βάτου.
31 ὁ δὲ Μωσῆς ἰδὼν ἐθαύμαζεν τὸ ὅραμα·
καὶ προσερχομένου αὐτοῦ κατανοῆσαι
ὁ Κύριος εἶπεν αὐτῷ λέγων·

25 *αὐτοῖς σωτηρίαν E* δ, 𝕷^{g}, 𝕾, *Aug.* οὐ *cett.* (𝕷^{d}): *om. D* 26 τότε *D*: τῇ τε (δέ *E*, 𝕷^{p} *vg.*, 𝕾^{vg}) *cett.* μαχομένοις] + inter se 𝕷^{g}, 𝕾^{vg} καί . . . ἀδικοῦντας *D*: *om. cett. prom.* συνήλασεν *AE* 614 τί ποιεῖτε *D*: *om. cett. prom.* ἀδελφοί *D*, *prom.*: ἀδελφοί ἐστε (+ ὑμεῖς δ 𝕾^{ph}) *cett.* εἰς *D*: *om. cett.* 27 πλησίον] + αὐτοῦ 𝕷^{g} *vg.*^{aqw} εἴπας *D*: εἰπών Γ *E* δ καί] ἤ *E*, 𝕷^{gp} *vg.*^{a}, *prom.* ἐφ' ἡμᾶς *DE* δ: ἐφ' ἡμῶν Γ 28 χθές *E* δ (hesterno die interfecisti 𝕷^{g}) 29 οὕτως καί *D*: *om. cett.* ἐφυγάδευσεν Μωυσῆς *D*: ἐφυγάδευσεν δὲ Μωυσῆν *E*: ἔφυγεν δὲ Μωυσῆς Γ δ (fugatus est autem Moses 𝕷^{g}: effugavit autem se Moses 𝕷^{p}) ἐν τῷ] *om.* ἐν 𝕷^{g} 30 μετὰ ταῦτα *D*: *om. cett.* πλησθέντων *D*: πληρωθέντων Γ *E* δ αὐτῷ (et (= ei) 𝕷^{d}, *ante* πλησθ.) *D*: αὐτῷ ἐκεῖ 𝕾^{vg}: *om. cett.* ἐτῶν *cett.* (𝕷^{d}): ἔτη *D* τοῦ ὄρους] in monte 𝕷^{dg} κυρίου *DE* δ, 𝕷^{p} *vg.*^{qw}, 𝕾: *om. cett.* πυρὶ φλογός *ACE* 31 ἐθαύμασεν *ABC* 383 καὶ προσερχομένου *D*, 𝕷^{g} *vg.*, 𝕾^{vg}: προσερχομένου δέ *cett.* καὶ κατανοῆσαι (et consideraret 𝕷^{d}) *D* ὁ κύριος εἶπεν αὐτῷ λέγων *D*: ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ

32 Ἐγὼ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου,
ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Θεὸς Ἰακώβ.
ἔντρομος δὲ γενόμενος Μωσῆς
οὐκ ἐτόλμα κατανοῆσαι.
33 καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ πρὸς αὐτόν·
Λῦσον τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν σου·
ὁ γὰρ τόπος οὗ ἕστηκας γῆ ἁγία ἐστίν.
34 καὶ ἰδὼν γὰρ εἶδον
τὴν κάκωσιν τοῦ λαοῦ μου τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ,
καὶ τοῦ στεναγμοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀκήκοα,
καὶ κατέβην ἐξελέσθαι αὐτούς.
καὶ νῦν δεῦρο, ἀποστείλω σε εἰς Αἴγυπτον.
35 τοῦτον τὸν Μωσῆν
ὃν ἠρνήσαντο εἰπόντες·
Τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν ἐφ' ἡμῶν;
τοῦτον ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἄρχοντα
καὶ λυτρωτὴν ἀπέσταλκεν σὺν χειρι ἀγγέλου
τοῦ ὀφθέντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ βάτῳ·
36 οὗτος ἐξήγαγεν αὐτούς,
ποιήσας τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα
ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ
καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἔτη τεσσεράκοντα·
37 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Μωσῆς ὁ εἴπας τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ·

τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσα πρὸς αὐτόν *E*: ἐγένετο (+πρὸς αὐτόν *vg.*) φωνὴ κυρίου (+πρὸς αὐτόν *C* δ, 𝔏^{g}: +λέγουσα 𝔏^{p} *vg.*) *cett.* 32 ἐγώ] +εἰμι *E*, 𝔏^{dg} *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖, 𝔈 θεὸς (ὁ θ. *E* 383) Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸς (ὁ θ. *E* 383) Ἰακώβ *DE* 383, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔈^{vt}: Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ *cett.* 33 καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ πρὸς αὐτόν *D*: εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ (*om.* αὐτῷ 𝔏^{p}) ὁ κύριος (θεός *E*) *cett.* τῶν] ἐκ τῶν *CE*, 𝔖 οὗ (in eo 𝔏^{d}) *D*: ἐφ' ᾧ Γ: ἐν ᾧ *E* δ 34 καὶ (*om.* 𝔏^{d}) ἰδὼν γάρ *D*: ἰδών *cett.* μου *om.* *D* τοῦ στεναγμοῦ] τῆς κραυγῆς LXX αὐτοῦ *DB*, 𝔖^{vg}: αὐτῶν *cett.* ἀκήκοα *D*: ἤκουσα *cett.* ἀποστέλλω *D* Γ *E* 614: ἀποστελῶ *cett.* (𝔏^{de}) 35 ἄρχοντα καὶ (ἤ 𝔏^{g}) δικαστήν *cett.*: δικαστὴν ἢ ἄρχοντα 𝔏^{p} ἐφ' ἡμῶν] ἐφ' ἡμᾶς *E*, *Chr.*: *om.* *AB* 383, *vg.* καὶ ἄρχοντα] ἄρχοντα ℵ *C* 383, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} σύν] ἐν ℵ 383, 𝔏^{dg} 36 ὁ ποιήσας *D* τέρατα] +μεγάλα 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*^{w} γῇ Αἰγύπτου *D* 614, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔖: γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ ℵ *AE* 383: τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ *BC*, 𝔏^{d}, 𝔈 (*cf.* xiii. 17) 37 ὁ *ante* Μωσ. *om.* *D* 383 εἰπών *E* δ

Προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει ὁ Θεὸς
ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡσεὶ ἐμέ·
αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε.
38 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ
ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ μετὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου
τοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σινᾶ
καὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν·
ὃς ἐδέξατο λόγια ζῶντα δοῦναι ἡμῖν·
39 ᾧ οὐκ ἠθέλησαν ὑπήκοοι γενέσθαι
οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ ἀπώσαντο
καὶ ἀπεστράφησαν ταῖς καρδίαις εἰς Αἴγυπτον,
40 εἴπαντες τῷ Ἀαρών· Ποίησον ἡμῖν θεοὺς
οἳ προπορεύσονται ἡμῶν·
ὁ γὰρ Μωσῆς οὗτος,
ὃς ἐξήγαγεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου,
οὐκ οἴδαμεν τί γέγονεν αὐτῷ.
41 καὶ ἐμοσχοποίησαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις
καὶ ἀνήγαγον θυσίαν τῷ εἰδώλῳ,
καὶ ηὐφραίνοντο
ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν.
42 ἔστρεψεν δὲ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς
λατρεύειν τῇ στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ·

37 ὁ θεός] κύριος 614, 𝔖^{ph}: κύριος ὁ θεός (+ἡμῶν *E* 383) *CE* 383, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{vg} ὡσεί *D*: ὡς Γ *E* δ αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε *om.* ℵ *AB* 383, ℭ 38 τοῦ ἀγγέλου *om.* 𝔏^{g}, ℭ, *del. Bl.* τοῦ (*ante* λαλοῦντος) *om. D* ἐδέξατο] ἐξελέξατο *B* ζῶντα] viventium 𝔏^{d} : vitae *vg.* : θεοῦ ζῶντος *Iren.* ἡμῖν] ὑμῖν ℵ *B*, 𝔏^{p}, *Iren.* 39 ᾧ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Iren.* : ὅτι *D* ἀπώσαντο] +αὐτόν 𝔏^{gp2}, *vg.*^{aq} ταῖς καρδίαις *D*, *Orig.* : ἐν (*om. E*, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}) ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν Γ *E*, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, ℭ : τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *Iren.* : ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν 𝔏^{g} 40 οὗτος *om.* 𝔏^{p}, *Iren.* : + ὁ ἄνθρωπος ℵ ὃς ἐξήγαγεν] ὁ ἐξαγαγών *E* οὐκ οἴδαμεν *post* τί γέγονεν αὐτῷ *hab. Iren.* γέγονεν *DE* δ: ἐγένετο Γ 41 ἀνήγαγον *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : ἀπηγάγοντο *D* ηὐφραίνοντο *DE* : εὐφρ. Γ δ 42 ἔστρεψεν δέ (+αὐτούς *C*, ℭ) *cett.* : τότε δὲ ἔστρεψεν αὐτούς 𝔏^{h} στρατιᾷ ℵ *CE* δ : στρατείᾳ *DAB*, *Orig.* : exercitibus 𝔖^{vg}, *Iren.* τῶν *om. D* ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ *cett. Iren. Orig.* : *om.* *B*^{1}, *Fil.* Ἰσραήλ] +λέγει κύριος *C* : +λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ *Fil.* (*cf. ad v.* 43) 43 τοῦ θεοῦ *DB*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, ℭ, *Iren. Orig.* : τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν (ἡμῶν 614) *cett.* Ῥεμφάμ *D*, 𝔏^{ghp} *vg.*, *Iren. Fil.* : Ῥομφάν ℵ : Ῥομφά *B*, *Orig.* : Ῥαιφάν *A* :

καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφητῶν·
Μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας
προσηνέγκατέ μοι ἔτη τεσσεράκοντα
ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οἶκος Ἰσραήλ;
43 καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μολὸχ
καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ Ῥεμφάμ,
τοὺς τύπους οὓς ἐποιήσατε προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς·
καὶ μετοικιῶ ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰ μέρη Βαβυλῶνος.
44 ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἦν
ἐν τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ,
καθὼς διετάξατο ὁ λαλῶν τῷ Μωσῇ
ποιῆσαι αὐτὴν κατὰ τὸν τύπον ὃν ἑωράκει,
45 ἣν καὶ εἰσήγαγον διαδεξάμενοι
οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν μετὰ Ἰησοῦ
ἐν τῇ κατασχέσει τῶν ἐθνῶν,
ὧν ἐξῶσεν ὁ Θεὸς
ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν,
ἕως τῶν ἡμερῶν Δαυίδ,
46 ὃς εὗρεν χάριν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ,
καὶ ᾐτήσατο σκήνωμα εὑρεῖν
τῷ Θεῷ Ἰακώβ.
47 Σολομὼν δὲ ᾠκοδόμησεν αὐτῷ οἶκον.

Ῥεφάν *CE* 383, 𝔖, 𝔈 : Ῥεαφάν 614 τούς] *καὶ τούς* 𝔏^{h} *ἐπὶ τὰ μέρη* *D*, 𝔏^{g} : in partem 𝔏^{ep} : *ἐπέκεινα* (ultra 𝔏^{h}) *cett.* (*E*) : in illas partes 𝔏^{d} (*conflat.*) Βαβυλῶνος] Δαμασκοῦ LXX : + *λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ* 614 : + *λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* 𝔖^{ph} 44 *ἡ σκηνή . . . ἦν*] *καὶ ἡ σκηνή . . . ἦν* 𝔏^{h} : *καὶ ἦν ἡ σκ. . . .* 𝔏^{p} : ecce tabernaculum . . . erat 𝔖^{vg} *ἐν τοῖς DE* : *τοῖς* Γ δ *διετάξατο*] + *ὁ θεός* 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*^{aw} ὁ λαλῶν Γ *E* 383 (𝔏^{d}) : λαλῶν *D* 614 *αὐτήν om.* 𝔏^{p} *τὸν τύπον*] *τὸ πα || || τυπον D* (*παράτυπον Scriv.*) *ἑωράκει* Γ δ, 𝔏^{g} : *ἑώρακεν DE*, 𝔏^{h} 45 *εἰσήγαγον διαδεξάμενοι*] *om. διαδεξ.* 𝔏^{d} : introducendo introduxerunt 𝔖^{vg} *ἐν . . . ἐθνῶν*] in terram quam dedit eis deus hereditatem ex gentibus illis 𝔖^{vg} *ἐξῶσεν*] *ἐξέωσεν* ℵ *E* : salvavit (= *ἔσωσεν*) 𝔏^{h} *ἡμῶν cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : *ὑμῶν D* : *αὐτῶν* 𝔖^{vg} *ἕως . . .* Δαυίδ] et deportatum est (*i. e.* tabernaculum) usque ad dies David 𝔖^{vg} 46 *καὶ ᾐτήσατο om.* ℵ *σκήνωμα εὑρεῖν D*, 𝔏^{h} : *εὑρεῖν σκήνωμα cett.* *θεῷ* (in deo 𝔏^{h}) *cett.* : *οἴκῳ* (sedes domui 𝔏^{d}) *D* ℵ *B*, 𝔈^{vt} (*ex. v.* 47) 47 *αὐτῷ om.* 𝔏^{p}

48 ὁ δὲ ὕψιστος οὐ κατοικεῖ ἐν χειροποιήτοις·
ὡς ὁ προφήτης λέγει·
49 Ὁ οὐρανός μού ἐστιν θρόνος,
ἡ δὲ γῆ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν μου·
ποῖον οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετέ μοι; λέγει Κύριος,
ἢ ποῖος τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεώς μου **ἐστίν**;
50 οὐχὶ ἡ χείρ μου ἐποίησεν πάντα ταῦτα;
51 σκληροτράχηλοι καὶ ἀπερίτμητοι
καρδίαις καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν,
ὑμεῖς ἀεὶ τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ ἀντιπίπτετε·
καθὼς οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν, καὶ ὑμεῖς.
52 τίνα τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ ἐδίωξαν ἐκεῖνοι;
καὶ ἀπέκτειναν **αὐτοὺς**
τοὺς προκαταγγέλλοντας περὶ τῆς ἐλεύσεως τοῦ δικαίου·
οὗ νῦν ὑμεῖς προδόται καὶ φονεῖς ἐγένεσθε·
53 οἵτινες ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον
εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων, καὶ οὐκ ἐφυλάξατε.
54 ἀκούσαντες δὲ αὐτοῦ διεπρίοντο
ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν
ἔβρυχόν τε τοὺς ὀδόντας ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν.
55 ὑπάρχων δὲ πλήρης Πνεύματος Ἁγίου

48 ὁ δέ . . . χειροποιήτοις *D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Tert.*: ἀλλ᾽ οὐχ ὁ ὕψιστος (ὁ ὕψ. οὐκ 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Aug.*) ἐν χειρ. (+ναοῖς 383, *Aug.*) κατοικεῖ *cett. Aug.* $\frac{3}{3}$ ὡς *D*: ὡς καί *E*: καθώς Γ δ λέγει ὁ προφητής 𝔏^{h}: per prophetam dixit 𝔏^{g} 49 μού ἐστιν θρόνος *D*, 𝔏^{ep}, 𝔖^{vg}: μοὶ θρόνος (+ἐστιν 𝔏^{h} *vg.*, *ps.-Orig.*) *cett. ps.-Orig.* ἡ δὲ γῆ] καὶ ἡ γῆ *B*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg} ποῖον . . . ἐστίν *om. ps.-Orig.* λέγει κύριος *om.* 𝔏^{ghp} ἐστίν *D*, 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph} (*lacer est* 𝔏^{h}): *om. cett.* 50 οὐχί . . . ταῦτα *hab.* 𝔏^{h} *teste Buch.*: *om. Berg.* πάντα ταῦτα *DACE*, 𝔏^{p}, *Orig.*: ταῦτα πάντα *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) 51 καρδίαις (ταῖς κ. ℵ, *Chr.*) *cett.*: τῇ καρδίᾳ *E* δ, 𝔏^{gh}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Eus. Aug.* $\frac{6}{6}$ *alii* ἀντιπίπτετε] obstitistis (restitistis) 𝔏^{dgp}, *Aug. alii*: contradixistis (=ἀντείπατε) 𝔏^{h} καθώς *D*: ὡς Γ *E* δ ὑμῶν καὶ ὑμεῖς *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Luc.*: καὶ ὑμῶν *D*: ὑμῶν 𝔏^{gh}, *Aug. alii* 52 ἐκεῖνοι *D*, 𝔏^{h}: οἱ (ὡς οἱ *E*) πατέρες ὑμῶν *cett. Orig. Aug. Hier.* αὐτούς *D*: *om.* Γ *E* δ, *Orig.* προκαταγγέλλοντας *D*, 𝔏^{gp}, *Aug.*: προκαταγγείλαντας *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Orig.* τῆς Γ *E* δ: *om. D* νῦν *om. E*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Vig.* φονεῖς] latrones 𝔏^{h} 54 ἀκούσαντες *D*, 𝔏^{h}, *Luc.*: ἀκούοντες *cett.* (𝔏^{g}) αὐτοῦ *D*: ταῦτα (*om.* ℵ) *cett.* ταῖς] ἐν ταῖς 𝔏^{gh} ἔβρυχόν τε] καὶ ἔβρυχόν τε *D*: καὶ ἔβρυχον *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) ὀδόντας]+αὐτῶν *E*, 𝔖, 𝔈

ἀτενίσας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἶδεν δόξαν Θεοῦ,
καὶ Ἰησοῦν **τὸν Κύριον** *ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἑστῶτα,*
56 *καὶ εἶπεν· Ἰδοὺ θεωρῶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς*
ἠνεῳγμένους καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
ἐκ δεξιῶν ἑστῶτα τοῦ Θεοῦ.
57 *κράξαντες δὲ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*
συνέσχαν τὰ ὦτα αὐτῶν
καὶ ὥρμησαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν,
58 *καὶ ἐκβαλόντες ἔξω τῆς πόλεως*
ἐλιθοβόλουν **αὐτόν·**
καὶ οἱ μάρτυρες ἀπέθεντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν
παρὰ τοὺς πόδας νεανίου **τινὸς**
καλουμένου Σαύλου.
59 *καὶ ἐλιθοβόλουν τὸν Στέφανον,*
ἐπικαλούμενον καὶ λέγοντα·
60 Κύριε *Ἰησοῦ, δέξαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. θεὶς δὲ τὰ γόνατα*
ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ **λέγων·**
Κύριε, *μὴ στήσῃς αὐτοῖς ταύτην τὴν ἁμαρτίαν.*
καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐκοιμήθη.

VIII

1 *Σαῦλος δὲ ἦν συνευδοκῶν τῇ ἀναιρέσει αὐτοῦ.*

55 ὑπάρχων δέ] Στέφανος δὲ ὑπάρχων 614, *vg.*^{q}, *spec.* πλήρης] + πίστεως καί ℵ, 𝔖^{vg} (ὁ δὲ ὑπάρχων ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ 𝔏^{h}) τὸν κύριον *D* 614, 𝔏^{hp} : *om. cett. Vigil. Hier.* τοῦ θεοῦ] τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ (*om.* τοῦ θεοῦ *const. Ap.*, *Bl.*) 𝔏^{h} *vg.*^{w}, *const. Ap.*, *Orig.*^{lat} *Bl.* ἑστῶτα *post* τοῦ θεοῦ *hab. D*, 𝔏^{h} : *ante* ἐκ δεξ. *cett. Tert. Aug. alii* : *om. Iren.* 56 ἠνεῳγμένους (ἀν- *E* δ) *DE* δ : διηνοιγμένους Γ ἀνθρώπου] θεοῦ 614 ἑστῶτα *ante* τοῦ θεοῦ *hab. DB* 614, *post* τοῦ θεοῦ 𝔏^{dh}, *ante* ἐκ δεξ. *cett. Aug.* $\frac{7}{7}$ *alii* 57 κράξαντες δέ) tunc populus exclamavit 𝔏^{h}, 𝔈 (*fere*) : et cum exclamasset (=καὶ κράξαντος) 𝔏^{d} : *cf. Arm.*^{cat} 58 ἐκβαλόντες] + αὐτόν *A*, 𝔏^{h} *vg.*, 𝔖 αὐτόν *D*, 𝔏^{hp}, 𝔖, 𝔈 : *om. cett.* (𝔏^{g}) καὶ οἱ] + ψευδεῖς 𝔏^{gpt} *vg.*^{a}, *cf. Ephr.* τινός *D*, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.* 59 Ἰησοῦ] + Χριστέ *C* 614, *vg.*, *Chr.* 60 θεὶς δέ] θείς τε 𝔏^{dg} : θείς *D* φωνῇ μεγάλῃ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : φωνὴν μεγάλην *D* (*om.* ℵ) λέγων *D*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, *spec.* : ἐπικαλούμενος καὶ λέγων 𝔈^{vt} (*ex. v.* 59) : *om. cett.* κύριε] + Ἰησοῦ *c.Th.* ταύτην τὴν ἁμαρτίαν *cett. Cypr. Amb. Aug.*, *spec.* : τὴν ἁμ. ταύτην ℵ *E* 614, 𝔏^{d}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Iren. Orig. Eus.* καὶ . . . ἐκοιμήθη (+ ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q}) *cett.* : *om.* 614
VIII 1 τῇ ἀναιρέσει αὐτοῦ] τῇ ἀναιρ. τοῦ Στεφάνου 𝔏^{h} : τῇ πονηρίᾳ αὐτῶν 𝔏^{p}

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
διωγμὸς μέγας καὶ θλῖψις
ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις·
πάντες δὲ διεσπάρησαν
κατὰ τὰς χώρας τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Σαμαρείας,
πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων,
οἳ ἔμειναν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ.
2 *συνεκόμισαν δὲ τὸν Στέφανον ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς,*
καὶ ἐποίησαν κοπετὸν μέγαν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ.
3 *ὁ δὲ Σαῦλος ἐλυμαίνετο τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*
κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους εἰσπορευόμενος,
σύρων τε ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας
παρεδίδου εἰς φυλακήν.
4 *οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες*
διῆλθον εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν λόγον
⟨κατὰ τὰς πόλεις καὶ κώμας τῆς Ἰουδαίας⟩·
5 *Φίλιππος δὲ κατελθὼν*
εἰς τὴν πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας
ἐκήρυσσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Χριστόν.
6 **ὡς δὲ ἤκουον** *πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι,*
προσεῖχον τοῖς λεγομένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Φιλίππου
ὁμοθυμαδόν, ἐν τῷ ἀκούειν αὐτοὺς
καὶ βλέπειν τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει·
7 *πολλοῖς γὰρ τῶν ἐχόντων*

1 *ἐγένετο δέ . . . ἡμέρᾳ*] [et in illi]s diebus facta est 𝕷^{h} *διωγμὸς μέγας καὶ θλῖψις D*: *θλῖψις καὶ διωγμὸς μέγας* 𝕷^{h}, 𝕰: *διωγμὸς μέγας cett. Aug. Cass.* *τῆς om. D* *οἳ ἔμειναν ἐν Ἰερουσ. D*, 𝕷^{gh}, 𝕰, *Arm.*^{cat} *Aug.*^{c} (*et serm.* 315): *om. cett.* 2 *συνέκομισαν δὲ* (*τε* 𝕷^{d}) *cett.*: *συγκομίσαντες D* *ἐποιήσαντο E δ* 3 *ὁ δὲ Σαῦλ. D*: *Σαῦλος δέ Γ E δ* 4 *διῆλθον*] + *κατὰ τὰς πόλεις καὶ κώμας Aug.*^{c} *τὸν λόγον*] + *τοῦ θεοῦ E*, 𝕷^{p2t}, 𝕾^{vg}, *Aug.*^{c} *κατὰ τὰς πόλεις . . . Ἰουδαίας* 𝕷^{p1} *vg.*^{qw}: *κατὰ τὰς πόλεις* 𝕰: *om. cett.* (*D*) 5 *τὴν πόλιν* ℵ *AB*: *πόλιν DCE δ* (Samaria in civitate 𝕷^{p1}, *εἰς Σαμάρειαν τὴν πόλιν Bl.*) *Σαμαρείας*] Καισαρείας ℵ 6 *ὡς δὲ ἤκουον D*, 𝕾^{vg}: *om. cett.* (𝕷^{d}) *πάντες* (*πᾶν D*: omnes 𝕷^{d}) *οἱ ὄχλοι προσεῖχον D*: *οἱ ἐκεῖ προσεῖχον* 𝕾^{vg}: *προσεῖχον δὲ* (*τε E δ*, 𝕷^{g}) *οἱ ὄχλοι cett.* *τοῦ om. D* *ὁμοθυμαδόν cett.* (𝕷^{d}): || || || || *οντ* (?) *D* *αὐτούς*] *αὐτοῦ* ℵ, 𝕷^{p}, 𝕰: *om.* 𝕷^{g} 7 *πολλοῖς*] || || || *πολλοῖς* (a multis 𝕷^{d}) *D* (*π*[*αρ*]*α ante πολλοῖς legit Scriv.*: *παμπόλλοις coni. Bl.*): *πολλῶν δ*, *Chr.*: *πολλοί*

πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα
βοῶντα φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐξήρχοντο,
πολλοὶ δὲ παραλελυμένοι καὶ χωλοὶ
ἐθεραπεύοντο.
8 *χαρά τε μεγάλη ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ.*
9 *ἀνὴρ δέ τις ὀνόματι Σίμων*
προϋπάρχων ἐν τῇ πόλει μαγεύων
ἐξίστανεν τὸ ἔθνος τῆς Σαμαρείας,
λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτὸν μέγαν·
10 *ᾧ προσεῖχον πάντες ἀπὸ μικροῦ*
ἕως μεγάλου λέγοντες·
Οὗτός *ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ* Θεοῦ
11 *ἡ καλουμένη μεγάλη. προσεῖχον δὲ αὐτῷ*
διὰ τὸ ἱκανῷ χρόνῳ ταῖς μαγίαις
ἐξεστακέναι αὐτούς.
12 *ὅτε δὲ ἐπίστευσαν τῷ Φιλίππῳ*
εὐαγγελιζομένῳ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ,
καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
ἐβαπτίζοντο ἄνδρες τε καὶ γυναῖκες.
13 *ὁ δὲ Σίμων καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίστευσεν,*
καὶ βαπτισθεὶς ἦν
προσκαρτερῶν τῷ Φιλίππῳ·
θεωρῶν τε σημεῖα καὶ δυνάμεις μεγάλας
γινομένας ἐξίστατο.

cett. *ἅ ante βοῶντα add. Bl.* ἐξήρχοντο] ἐξήρχετο *Chr.*: ἐξήρχ. ἀπ' αὐτῶν $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: et sanabantur $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ καὶ χωλοί] χωλοί *D* ἐθεραπεύοντο *D*: ἐθεραπεύθησαν Γ *E* δ 8 χαρά τε (*om.* τε $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) μεγάλη ἐγένετο *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: καὶ ἐγέν. χαρὰ μεγάλη *E* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: ἐγέν. δὲ πολλὴ χαρά Γ 9 προϋπάρχων *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Iren.*: προϋπῆρχεν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) ἐξίστανεν *Bl.*: ἐξε- *ante ras. D* (et mentem auferens $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$): καὶ ἐξιστάνων (ἐξιστῶν *E* δ) Γ *E* δ, *Iren.* μέγαν *cett. Iren.*: *om.* $\mathfrak{E}$, *del. Bl.* 10 πάντες *om.* 383, *Iren.* τοῦ θεοῦ *cett. Iren.*: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, *del. Bl.* καλουμένη (λεγομένη 614) *cett. Iren.*: *om.* 383, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$ 12 τοῦ Φιλ. εὐαγγελιζομένου ℵ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ τὰ περί δ, *Chr.* 13 ὁ δὲ Σίμων καὶ αὐτός] et Simon $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ καὶ προσκαρτερῶν *D*: καὶ προσεκαρτέρει $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$ τε (δέ $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, *Chr.*) *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$ σημεῖα καὶ δυν. μεγάλας] δυν. καὶ σημ. μεγάλα *E*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: δυν. (+ μεγάλας *Chr.*) καὶ σημ. δ, *Chr.*: σημ. μεγάλα καὶ δυν. μεγάλας $\mathfrak{E}$ ἐξίσταντο D^{1} ℵ (*m.* 1) C^{1} (stupens admirabatur eis $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: attonitus fiebat et mirabatur $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$)

14 ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ
ἀπόστολοι ὅτι δέδεκται
ἡ Σαμάρεια τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ
ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς
15 Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην, οἵτινες
καταβάντες προσηύξαντο περὶ αὐτῶν,
ὅπως λάβωσιν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον.
16 οὐδέπω γὰρ ἦν ἐπὶ οὐδένα αὐτῶν
ἐπιπεπτωκός·
μόνον δὲ βεβαπτισμένοι ὑπῆρχον
εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ **Χριστοῦ**.
17 τότε ἐπετίθουν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς,
καὶ ἐλάμβανον Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον.
18 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Σίμων ὅτι διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως
τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων
δίδοται τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον,
προσήνεγκεν αὐτοῖς χρήματα
19 **παρακαλῶν καὶ** λέγων·
Δότε κἀμοὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην,
ἵνα ᾧ ἂν ἐπιθῶ **κἀγὼ** τὰς χεῖρας
λαμβάνῃ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον.
20 Πέτρος δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν·
Τὸ ἀργύριόν σου σὺν σοὶ εἴη εἰς ἀπώλειαν,
ὅτι τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐνόμισας
διὰ χρημάτων κτᾶσθαι.

14 Ἱερουσαλήμ *D*: Ἱεροσολύμοις Γ *E* δ ἡ] *καί* 614, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph} τοῦ θεοῦ (Χριστοῦ ℵ) *om.* 𝔏^{g} 16 ἐπὶ οὐδένα *D*: ἐπ᾽ οὐδενί Γ *E* δ ἐπιπεπτωκός *om.* 𝔏^{p} Χριστοῦ (*ante* Ἰησ. 383) *D* 383: *om. cett. Hier.* 17 ἐπετίθουν *cett. Iren. Hier.*: ἐπετίθεσαν Γ 18 τὸ ἅγιον *om.* ℵ *B*, 𝔈, *const. Ap.* 19 παρακαλῶν καί *D*, 𝔏^{gp}: *om. cett.* κἀμοι] μοι 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔈^{vt} ἄν *D*: ἐάν Γ *E* 383: *om.* 614 κἀγώ (*post* ἵνα 𝔏^{p}) *D*, 𝔏^{p}, *const. Ap.*: *om. cett. Aug.* 20 τό *om. D* (τὸ ἀργύριον . . . ἀπώλειαν *post* κτᾶσθαι *hab. Aug.* (*serm.* 100) σου *om. D* 21 μέρος *E* τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ] τῇ πίστει ταύτῃ 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Amb. Aug. const. Ap.* γάρ *om. D*, 𝔈 ἔναντι] ἐναντίον *C* 614: ἐνώπιον *E* 383 22 μετανόησον . . . καρδίας σου *om. Iren.* κυρίου] θεοῦ 383, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} 23 ἐν γὰρ πικρίας χολῇ (χολῇ πικρ. 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Iren.*) καὶ συνδέσμῳ *D*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}, *Iren. Ambst. Hier.*: εἰς γὰρ χολὴν

21 *οὐκ ἔστιν σοι μερὶς οὐδὲ κλῆρος ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ·*
ἡ γὰρ καρδία σου οὐκ ἔστιν εὐθεῖα ἔναντι τοῦ Θεοῦ.
22 *μετανόησον οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας σου ταύτης,*
καὶ δεήθητι τοῦ Κυρίου, εἰ ἄρα ἀφεθήσεταί σοι
ἡ ἐπίνοια τῆς καρδίας σου.
23 *ἐν γὰρ πικρίας χολῇ καὶ συνδέσμῳ*
ἀδικίας θεωρῶ σε ὄντα.
24 *ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Σίμων εἶπεν* **πρὸς αὐτούς·**
Παρακαλῶ, *δεήθητε ὑμεῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν,*
ὅπως μηδὲν ἐπέλθῃ μοι
τούτων τῶν κακῶν *ὧν εἰρήκατέ μοι·*
ὃς πολλὰ κλαίων οὐ διελίμπανεν.
25 *οἱ μὲν οὖν διαμαρτυράμενοι*
καὶ λαλήσαντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου,
ὑπέστρεφον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα,
πολλάς τε κώμας τῶν Σαμαρειτῶν
εὐηγγελίζοντο.
26 *ἄγγελος δὲ Κυρίου ἐλάλησεν πρὸς Φίλιππον λέγων·*
Ἀναστὰς πορεύθητι κατὰ μεσημβρίαν
εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν καταβαίνουσαν
ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ εἰς Γάζαν· αὕτη ἐστὶν ἔρημος.
27 *καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐπορεύθη·*
καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ Αἰθίοψ εὐνοῦχος δυνάστης
Κανδάκης βασιλίσσης **τινὸς** *Αἰθιόπων,*
ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γάζης αὐτῆς,

πικρίας καὶ σύνδεσμον Γ *E* δ θεωρῶ *DE* 614 : ὁρῶ Γ 383 24 πρὸς αὐτούς *D* : *om. cett.* παρακαλῶ *D*, 𝔏g, 𝔖ph, *const. Ap.* : *om. cett.* περί] ὑπέρ *E* δ, *const. Ap.* θεόν *D* 614, 𝔏p, 𝔖 : κύριον *cett.* (*c. Th.*) *const. Ap.* μοι *D* : ἐπ' ἐμέ Γ *E* δ τούτων τῶν κακῶν ὧν εἰρήκατέ μοι *D* : ὧν εἰρήκατε κακῶν *E* : ὧν εἰρήκατε *cett.* ὅς . . . διελίμπανεν *D c. Th.*, *Tert. Ephr.* (?) : *om. cett.* (*cf. Chr.* xviii. 147 δέον ἀπὸ καρδίας μετανοῆσαι, δέον κλαῦσαι) 25 διαμαρτυράμενοι] + τῷ πλήθει 𝔈 καὶ λαλήσαντες *om. Aug.* ὑπέστρεψαν *CE* δ τε] δέ *D* Σαμαρειτῶν] + διελθόντες 𝔏g 26 ἀναστὰς πορεύθητι *D* : ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύου (-θητι *C*) Γ *E* δ κατά] πρός *E* 614 27 ἀνήρ] + τις 𝔏gt *vg.*a τινός *D* : *om. cett.* αὐτῆς ℵ *A*, 𝔏p : αὐτοῦ *D* : αὐτῆς ὅς (hic 𝔏g) *cett.*

ἐληλύθει προσκυνήσων εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ·
28 ἦν τε ὑποστρέφων καθήμενος
ἐπὶ τοῦ ἅρματος καὶ ἀναγινώσκων
τὸν προφήτην Ἠσαΐαν.
29 εἶπεν δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τῷ Φιλίππῳ·
Πρόσελθε καὶ κολλήθητι τῷ ἅρματι τούτῳ. 30 προσδραμὼν
δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος ἤκουσεν αὐτοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος τὸν προφήτην
Ἠσαΐαν καὶ εἶπεν· Ἆρά γε γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις; 31 ὁ
δὲ εἶπεν· Πῶς γὰρ ἂν δυναίμην ἐὰν μή τις ὁδηγήσει με;
παρεκάλεσεν δὲ τὸν Φίλιππον ἀναβάντα καθίσαι σὺν αὐτῷ.
32 ἡ δὲ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς ἣν ἀνεγίνωσκεν ἦν αὕτη· Ὡς
πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη, καὶ ὡς ἀμνὸς ἐναντίον τοῦ κείροντος
αὐτὸν ἄφωνος, οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ. 33 ἐν τῇ
ταπεινώσει ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἤρθη, τὴν δὲ γενεὰν αὐτοῦ τίς
διηγήσεται; ὅτι αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ. 34 ἀποκρι-
θεὶς δὲ ὁ εὐνοῦχος τῷ Φιλίππῳ εἶπεν· Δέομαί σου, περὶ τίνος
ὁ προφήτης λέγει τοῦτο; περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἢ περὶ ἑτέρου τινός;
35 ἀνοίξας δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ
τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης εὐηγγελίσατο αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰησοῦν. 36 ὡς δὲ
ἐπορεύοντο κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν, ἦλθον ἐπί τι ὕδωρ, καί φησιν ὁ
εὐνοῦχος· Ἰδοὺ ὕδωρ· τί κωλύει με βαπτισθῆναι; 37 **εἶπεν**

27 εἰς *om.* *D* 28 τε] δέ *BC* 614, 𝔏^{e}, 𝔖^{ph} καθήμενος *D*, *vg.* : καὶ καθήμενος *cett.* ἅρματος *D*, 𝔖^{vg} : + αὐτοῦ *cett.* καί *om.* *D*^{1} ℵ, 𝔏^{gp} ἀναγινώσκων *D*, 𝔏^{p} : καὶ (*om.* ℵ, 𝔏^{g}) ἀνεγίνωσκεν *cett.* 29 πνεῦμα] + τοῦ θεοῦ 𝔏^{p} : + τὸ ἅγιον 𝔖^{vg} τούτῳ] αὐτοῦ 614, 𝔏^{eg}, 𝔖^{ph} 30 προσδραμὼν δέ] καὶ προσδραμών 𝔏^{gpt} τὸν προφήτην Ἠσαΐαν *DE* δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph} : Ἠσ. τὸν προφήτην *cett.* *Iren.* ἆρά γε] si 𝔏^{g} 31 γάρ *om.* *E*, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 ἂν δυναίμην] possum 𝔏^{g} *vg.* ὁδηγήσει ℵ *BCE* 614 : ὁδηγήσῃ *A* 383 32 κείροντος *B* : κείραντος ℵ *ACE* δ αὐτόν *om.* 𝔖^{vg}, *Iren.* $\frac{1}{2}$ *Tert.* *Orig.* ἀνοίγει] ἤνοιξεν 𝔏^{e} *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈, *Iren.* *Tert.* *Cypr.* αὐτοῦ *om.* 𝔏^{g}, *Iren.* $\frac{1}{2}$ *Tert.* $\frac{3}{6}$ 33 ἐν τῇ . . . ἤρθη *om.* 𝔏^{p}, *Iren.* $\frac{1}{2}$; *del.* *Bl.* ταπεινώσει *cett.* *Iren.* *Orig.* : + αὐτοῦ *CE* δ, 𝔖 δέ *om.* Γ, 𝔖^{ph} 34 τοῦτο *om.* *B* τινός *ante* ἑτέρου *hab.* *E*, 𝔖^{vg} : *om.* 𝔏^{g} 35 αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰησοῦν *om.* 𝔏^{p} 36 εὐνοῦχος] + τῷ Φιλίππῳ 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{w}, 𝔈 τί] τίς 𝔏^{gpt}, *Amb.* *Hil.* : quid est quod *Cypr.* 37 εἶπεν δέ . . . Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν (*sim.*) *E*, 𝔏^{gpt} *vg.*^{aw}, 𝔖, *Aug.* (*serm.* 100, 266) : εἶπεν δέ (*sim.*) . . . ἔξεστιν *Cypr.* *Pac.* : ἀποκριθεὶς δέ . . . Χριστόν *spec.* : πιστεύω . . . Χριστόν *Iren.* *Ambst.* : *om.* Γ δ, 𝔈, *Hier.* εἶπεν δέ] + αὐτῷ *E*, 𝔏^{t}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Aug.* $\frac{1}{2}$: τότε εἶπεν 𝔏^{p}, *Cypr.* εἰ] ἐάν *E*

**δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος· Εἰ πιστεύεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας, ἔξεστιν.
ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπεν· Πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν
Χριστόν.** 38 καὶ ἐκέλευσεν στῆναι τὸ ἅρμα, καὶ κατέβησαν
ἀμφότεροι εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, ὅ τε Φίλιππος καὶ ὁ εὐνοῦχος, καὶ
ἐβάπτισεν αὐτόν. 39 ὅτε δὲ ἀνέβησαν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, Πνεῦμα
Ἅγιον ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐνοῦχον, ἄγγελος δὲ Κυρίου ἥρπασεν
τὸν Φίλιππον **ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ**, καὶ οὐκ εἶδεν αὐτὸν οὐκέτι ὁ εὐνοῦχος·
ἐπορεύετο γὰρ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ χαίρων. 40 Φίλιππος δὲ
εὑρέθη εἰς Ἄζωτον, καὶ διερχόμενος εὐηγγελίζετο τὰς πόλεις
πάσας ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς Καισάρειαν·

IX

1 ὁ δὲ Σαῦλος ἔτι ἐμπνέων ἀπειλῆς καὶ φόνου εἰς τοὺς μαθήτας
τοῦ Κυρίου, προσελθὼν τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ 2 ᾐτήσατο παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ
ἐπιστολὰς εἰς Δαμασκὸν πρὸς τὰς συναγωγάς, ὅπως ἐάν τινας
εὕρῃ τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας, ἄνδρας τε καὶ γυναῖκας, δεδεμένους ἀγάγῃ
εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ. 3 ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι ἐγένετο αὐτὸν
ἐγγίζειν τῇ Δαμασκῷ. ἐξαίφνης τε περιήστραψεν αὐτὸν φῶς
ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. 4 καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν **μετὰ μεγάλης
ἐκστάσεως** ἤκουσεν φωνὴν λέγουσαν αὐτῷ· Σαούλ, Σαούλ, τί
με διώκεις; **σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν.** 5 εἶπεν δέ·

καρδίας] + σου *E*, 𝕷^{t} (ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδ. *om. Aug.* $\frac{2}{2}$ *Pac.*) ἔξεστιν] σωθήσει *E* : hoc 𝕷^{g} (*fort. ex* ħ *corruptelae signo ortum*) πιστεύω εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ *E* 38 εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ ἀμφότεροι *E* 614, 𝕾^{ph} καὶ ὁ εὐνοῦχος καί *om.* 𝕰 39 ἐκ] ἀπό *E* 614 ἅγιον (κυρίου 𝕾^{ph}) ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐνοῦχον ἄγγελος δέ *A* (*m.* 1 *in ras.*), 𝕷^{p} *vg.*^{aqw}, 𝕾^{ph}, *Aug.* $\frac{3}{4}$ *Hier.* $\frac{2}{4}$ *Cass. Ephr.* : *om. cett. Aug.*^{c} *Hier.* $\frac{2}{4}$ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ *c.Th.*, 𝕷^{p}, *Aug.*^{c} : *om. cett.* 40 καί] + ἐκεῖθεν 𝕾^{vg} IX 1 τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν 𝕷^{p} 2 ἐάν *ABC* δ : ἄν ℵ *E* ὄντας *om.* 𝕷^{egp} *vg.* (τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας *om.* 𝕰^{vt}) 3 καὶ ἐξαίφνης *E* δ, *Chr.* (*om.* ἐξαίφνης 𝕷^{g}) περιήστρ. αὐτόν *E* δ, 𝕷^{gp} *vg.*, 𝕾, *Amb.* : αὐτὸν περιήστρ. Γ ἐκ Γ : ἀπό *E* δ, *Chr.* 4 μετὰ μεγάλης ἐκστάσεως 𝕷^{pt} : . . . [pa]vore 𝕷^{h} (*cf.* horrore animi turbatus est *Amb.*, stupefactus stabat *Ephr.*) : *om. cett.* φωνῆν] + ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ 𝕷^{g}, *Amb.* σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν *E*, 𝕾, *Aug.* $\frac{6}{6}$ *Petil.* $\frac{2}{2}$ *Hier.* $\frac{2}{2}$: *om. cett.* (*c.Th.*) *Orig. Hil.* 5 εἶπεν δὲ (ὁ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη λέγων 𝕷^{h}, 𝕾^{vg}) τίς εἶ, κύριε *cett.* (𝕷^{g}), *Amb. Aug. Petil. Hil. Ephr.* : *om. Iren. Orig.* (εἶπεν δέ . . . πρὸς αὐτόν *om. Luc.*)

Τίς εἶ, Κύριε; **καὶ ὁ Κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν·** Ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς
ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὃν σὺ διώκεις. 6 **ὁ δὲ τρέμων καὶ θαμβῶν ἐπὶ τῷ**
γεγονότι αὐτῷ εἶπεν· Κύριε, **τί με θέλεις ποιῆσαι; καὶ ὁ Κύριος**
πρὸς αὐτόν· Ἀνάστηθι καὶ εἴσελθε εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ **ἐκεῖ**
λαληθήσεταί σοι ὅ τι σε δεῖ ποιεῖν. 7 οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ συν-
οδεύοντες αὐτῷ εἱστήκεισαν ἐνεοί, ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς,
μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες **μεθ' οὗ ἐλάλει.** 8 **ἔφη δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς·**
Ἐγείρατέ με ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. **καὶ ἐγειράντων αὐτὸν** ἀνεῳγμένων
τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ οὐδὲν ἔβλεπεν· χειραγωγοῦντες δὲ αὐτὸν
εἰσήγαγον εἰς Δαμασκόν. 9 καὶ ἦν ἡμέρας τρεῖς μὴ βλέπων,
καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲ ἔπιεν· 10 (12) καὶ εἶδεν ἐν ὁράματι ἄνδρα
Ἀνανίαν ὀνόματι εἰσελθόντα καὶ ἐπιθέντα αὐτῷ χεῖρας ὅπως
ἀναβλέψῃ. 11 (10) ἦν δέ τις μαθητὴς ἐν Δαμασκῷ ὀνόματι
Ἀνανίας, καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν ὁράματι ὁ Κύριος· Ἀνανία.
ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· Ἰδοὺ ἐγώ, Κύριε. 12 (11) ὁ δὲ Κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν·
Ἀναστὰς πορεύθητι ἐπὶ τὴν ῥύμην τὴν καλουμένην εὐθεῖαν, καὶ
ζήτησον ἐν οἰκίᾳ Ἰούδα Σαῦλον ὀνόματι Ταρσέα· ἰδοὺ γὰρ

5 *καὶ ὁ* (*ὁ δέ E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$) *κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν* (+*εἶπεν c.Th.*) *c.Th. E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{pt}$: *καὶ ὁ* (*ὁ δέ* 383) *κύριος εἶπεν* 383, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}$: ὁ δὲ εἶπεν ℵ 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ὁ δέ *ABC*, *vg.*, *Aug.* Ἰησοῦς] +Χριστός *Iren.* : ὁ κύριος Ἰησ. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ ὁ Ναζωραῖος *ACE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hpt}$ *vg.*^{qw}, $\mathfrak{S}$, *Aug. Petil. Hil.* : *om. cett. Iren.* διώκεις] +σκληρὸν (vanum autem $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$) σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν $\mathfrak{L}^{ghpt}$ *vg.*^{w}, *Amb. Luc.* 6 ὁ δὲ τρέμων καὶ θαμβῶν (*om.* καὶ θαμβῶν $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, *Ephr.*) $\mathfrak{L}^{hpt}$ *vg.*^{a}, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Aug. Petil. Hil. Ephr.* : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι αὐτῷ $\mathfrak{L}^{ht}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Hil. Ephr.* : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$), *Aug. Petil.* εἶπεν, κύριε, τί με θέλεις ποιῆσαι $\mathfrak{L}^{hpt}$ *vg.*^{a}, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Aug. Petil. Hil. Ephr. alii* : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) καὶ ὁ κύριος (+ἔφη *c.Th.*) πρὸς αὐτόν $\mathfrak{L}^{hpt}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Aug. Petil.* : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) ἀνάστηθι $\mathfrak{L}^{hpt}$ *vg.* : ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι *cett.* : ἀνάστηθι ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ ἐκεῖ 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}$, *Tert.* : *om. cett.* ὅ τι] τί *E* δ, *Chr.* 7 ἐνεοί *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ μεθ' οὗ ἐλάλει $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ὃς ἐλάλει $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ *vg.*^{qw} : cum (? = cui) loqueretur $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* 8 ἔφη δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς ἐγείρατέ με $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$ *vg.*^{qw} : ἠγέρθη δὲ Σαῦλος *cett. Petil.* καὶ ἐγειράντων αὐτόν $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* οὐδένα *A*^{2}*CE* δ, *Chr.* δέ] τε $\mathfrak{L}^{ghp}$ εἰσήγαγον] εἰσῆλθον $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ 9 καὶ ἦν] καὶ οὕτως ἔμενεν $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ *vg.* ἡμέρας τρεῖς] +καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας *vg.*^{w} μή] μηδέν $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ 10 (12) καὶ εἶδεν . . . ἀναβλέψῃ *post* ἰδοὺ γὰρ προσεύχεται *hab. cett.* : *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *huc transtuli* ἐν ὁράματι *ante* ἄνδρα *hab. E* δ, *vg.*^{a}, $\mathfrak{S}$, *post* ἄνδρα *BC* : *om. cett.* ὀνόματι Ἀνανίαν 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}$ χεῖρα δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}$: *Chr.* 11 (10) καὶ εἶπεν . . . ὁ κύριος (ὁ κύρ. ἐν ὁράματι δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$) *cett.* : [et ei in] visione dominus ait $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ ὁ δέ . . . κύριε] qui respon[dit quis] es

προσεύχεται. 13 ἀπεκρίθη δὲ Ἀνανίας· Κύριε, ἤκουσα ἀπὸ
πολλῶν περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου ὅσα κακὰ τοῖς ἁγίοις σου
ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ. 14 καὶ ὧδε ἔχει ἐξουσίαν παρὰ
τῶν ἀρχιερέων δῆσαι πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους τὸ ὄνομά
σου. 15 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος· Πορεύου, ὅτι
σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς ἐστίν μοι οὗτος τοῦ βαστάσαι τὸ ὄνομά μου
ἐνώπιον ἐθνῶν τε καὶ βασιλέων υἱῶν τε Ἰσραήλ· 16 ἐγὼ γὰρ
ὑποδείξω αὐτῷ ὅσα δεῖ αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματός μου παθεῖν.
17 **τότε ἐγερθεὶς** Ἀνανίας ἀπῆλθεν καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν,
καὶ ἐπιθεὶς ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας **ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**
εἶπεν· Σαοὺλ ἀδελφέ, ὁ Κύριος ἀπέσταλκέν με Ἰησοῦς ὁ ὀφθείς
σοι ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ᾗ ἤρχου, ὅπως ἀναβλέψῃς καὶ πλησθῇς Πνεύ-
ματος Ἁγίου. 18 καὶ εὐθέως ἀπέπεσαν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν
αὐτοῦ ὡς λεπίδες, ἀνέβλεψέν τε **παραχρῆμα** καὶ ἀναστὰς
ἐβαπτίσθη, 19 καὶ λαβὼν τροφὴν ἐνίσχυσεν. ἐγένετο δὲ
μετὰ τῶν ἐν Δαμασκῷ μαθητῶν ἡμέρας τινάς· 20 καὶ
εὐθέως εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς **τῶν Ἰουδαίων** ἐκήρυσσεν

domine 𝔏^{h} *sec. Berg.*: qui respon[dens ait i]ta domine *sec. Buch.* 12 (11) ὁ δέ] καί 𝔏^{ht} *vg.*, 𝔖 ἀνάστα *B*, 𝔏^{h} *vg.*, 𝔖 Σαῦλον (+τινα 𝔖^{ph}) ὀνόματι *cett.*: ὀνόματι Σαῦλον 𝔏^{h}, *Aug.* Ταρσέα] τῷ γένει Ταρσέα 𝔏^{hp}: qui est ex civitate Tarso 𝔖^{vg} προσεύχεται] +αὐτός *ante.* προσ. 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*^{a}, *post* προσ. 𝔏^{h} (ecce enim cum ipse oraret vidit 𝔖^{vg}) 13 ἀπεκρίθη δέ] καὶ εἶπεν 𝔖^{vg}: ἀπεκρίθη δὲ καὶ εἶπεν *E*, *vg.*^{w}, 𝔈 ἤκουσα] ἀκήκοα δ, *Chr.*: +ἐγώ 𝔏^{hp}, *Bl.* ἀπὸ πολλῶν *post* τούτου *hab.* 𝔏^{h}: *om. Aug.* $\frac{2}{2}$ ὅσα κακά] quantas persecutiones 𝔏^{h} ἐποίησεν τοῖς ἁγίοις σου δ, 𝔏^{ht} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug.* 14 καὶ ὧδε] καὶ ἰδού 𝔏^{h}: καὶ ἰδοὺ καὶ ὧδε 𝔖^{vg} ἐξουσίαν (+in nos) *post* ἀρχ. *hab.* 𝔏^{h} 15 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτόν] cui dixit 𝔏^{h} (ὁ δὲ κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν *Aug.* $\frac{2}{2}$) μοί ἐστιν οὗτος *E*, *vg.*^{q}: ἐστιν οὗτός μοι 𝔏^{g} (*om.* οὗτος 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug.*^{c}) υἱῶν τε] υἱῶν 614, 𝔏^{gp1} Ἰσραήλ] +μεγαλύνεσθαι *Aug.* 16 αὐτῷ] +ex ipso *Iren.* 17 τότε ἐγερθεὶς (*om.* ἐγερθείς 𝔖^{vg}) Ἀναν. ἀπῆλθεν (εἰσῆλθεν 𝔏^{h}: +καὶ εἰσῆλθεν 614) 614, 𝔏^{hp}, 𝔖^{vg}: ἀπῆλθεν δὲ Ἀναν. καὶ εἰσῆλθεν *cett.* τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτόν *C*, 𝔏^{g}: [ei man]um 𝔏^{h} ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ 𝔏^{h}, *Chr.*: *om. cett.* σοι ὀφθείς 𝔏^{hp}, *Petil.* ὅπως ἀναβλέψῃς *om.* 𝔏^{g} 18 ὡς Γ: ὡσεί *E* δ, *Chr.* παραχρῆμα (*ante* ἀνέβλ. 𝔏^{h}) C^{2}*E* 614, 𝔏^{hpt}, 𝔈: *om. cett. Petil.* 19 ἐγένετο δέ . . . τινάς] dies autem plurimos et in civitate Damas[co cum] discentibus transegit 𝔏^{h} 20 εὐθέως *om.* 𝔏^{h} εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὰς συν. 𝔏^{hp} *vg.*^{qw}, *spec.*: ἐν ταῖς συν. *cett.* τῶν Ἰουδαίων 𝔏^{hp} *vg.*^{w}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *spec.*: *om. cett.* ἐκήρυξεν (+αὐτοῖς *E*) *E*, 𝔏^{g}, *Bl.*

μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν **ὁ Χριστὸς**
ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. 21 ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες καὶ
ἔλεγον· Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πορθήσας **πάντας** ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ
τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο; καὶ ὧδε εἰς τοῦτο
ἐλήλυθεν ἵνα δεδεμένους αὐτοὺς ἀγάγῃ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς.
22 Σαῦλος δὲ μᾶλλον ἐνεδυναμοῦτο **ἐν τῷ λόγῳ**, καὶ συνέχυνεν
Ἰουδαίους τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν Δαμασκῷ, συμβιβάζων **καὶ
λέγων** ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός, **ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεός.**
23 ὡς δὲ ἐπληροῦντο ἡμέραι ἱκαναί, συνεβουλεύσαντο οἱ
Ἰουδαῖοι ἀνελεῖν αὐτόν· 24 ἐγνώσθη δὲ τῷ Σαύλῳ ἡ ἐπιβουλὴ
αὐτῶν. παρετηροῦντο δὲ καὶ τὰς πύλας ἡμέρας τε καὶ νυκτὸς
ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀνέλωσιν. 25 λαβόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ
νυκτὸς διὰ τοῦ τείχους καθῆκαν χαλάσαντες ἐν σπυρίδι.
26 παραγενόμενος δὲ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπειρᾶτο κολλᾶσθαι τοῖς
μαθηταῖς· καὶ πάντες ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτόν, μὴ πιστεύοντες ὅτι
ἐστὶν μαθητής. 27 Βαρνάβας δὲ ἐπιλαβόμενος αὐτὸν ἤγαγεν
πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους, καὶ διηγήσατο αὐτοῖς πῶς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ
εἶδεν τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ὅτι ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ, καὶ πῶς ἐν Δαμασκῷ
ἐπαρρησιάσατο ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 28 καὶ ἦν μετ'
αὐτῶν εἰσπορευόμενος καὶ ἐκπορευόμενος εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ
παρρησιαζόμενος ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου· 29 ἐλάλει τε καὶ
συνεζήτει πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνιστάς. οἱ δὲ ἐπεχείρουν ἀνελεῖν
αὐτόν. 30 ἐπιγνόντες δὲ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ κατήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Και-

20 *μετὰ πάσης* (*om. πάσης spec.*) *παρρησίας* $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, *Iren.*, *spec.*: *om. cett.* Ἰησοῦν] dominum [Iesum] $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: Χριστόν 383, *Chr.* ὁ Χριστός $\mathfrak{L}^{ht}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Iren.*, *spec.*: *om. cett.* *θεοῦ*] + *τοῦ ζῶντος spec.* 21 *πάντες om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *καί*] + intra se $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *πορθῶν* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *πάντας* (*post* Ἱερ. $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$) $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.* *καὶ ὧδε*] et huc quoque $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: et nunc quoque $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *ἐλήλυθεν E* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$ *vg.*: *ἐληλύθει* Γ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ 22 *ἐν* (*om. C*) *τῷ λόγῳ CE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$: *om. cett.* *καὶ λέγων E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: *om. cett.* *ἐν ᾧ* (*εἰς ὅν* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$) *εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεός* $\mathfrak{L}^{ghp}$: *om. cett.* 23 *ὡς . . . ἱκαναί*] et cum iam multi dies adimplerentur $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ 24 *αἱ ἐπιβουλαί* $\mathfrak{L}^{hp2}$ 25 *αὐτὸν οἱ μαθ.* (+ *αὐτοῦ* $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$) . . . *καθῆκαν E* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: *οἱ μαθ. αὐτοῦ . . . καθῆκαν αὐτόν* Γ, *Orig.* *διὰ τοῦ τείχ. post καθῆκαν hab.* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ 26 *δέ*] + ὁ Σαῦλος (Παῦλος *E* 383, *vg.*[q]) *E* δ, *vg.*[q], $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ *ἐπειρᾶτο E* δ, *Chr.*: *ἐπείραζεν* Γ 27 *ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *τοῦ* (*om. BC*) Ἰησοῦ] *κυρίου A*: *τοῦ κυρίου* Ἰησ. 383, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Chr.* 28 *καὶ παρρησ. E* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: *παρρησ. cett.* *τοῦ κυρίου*] Ἰησοῦ *C*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *τοῦ κυρίου* Ἰησ. δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ *vg.*[q] 30 *διὰ* (*om.* 614) *νυκτός E* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ *vg.*[aw],

σάρειαν **διὰ νυκτὸς** καὶ ἐξαπέστειλαν αὐτὸν εἰς Ταρσόν. 31 αἱ
μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Γαλιλαίας
καὶ Σαμαρείας εἶχον εἰρήνην οἰκοδομούμεναι καὶ πορευόμεναι
τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τῇ παρακλήσει τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος
ἐπληθύνοντο. 32 ἐγένετο δὲ Πέτρον διερχόμενον διὰ πάντων
κατελθεῖν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἁγίους τοὺς κατοικοῦντας Λύδδα. 33
εὗρεν δὲ ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωπόν τινα ὀνόματι Αἰνέαν ἐξ ἐτῶν ὀκτὼ κατα-
κείμενον ἐπὶ κραβάττου, ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος. 34 **ἀτενίσας
δὲ εἰς αὐτὸν ὁ Πέτρος** εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Αἰνέα, ἰᾶταί σε Ἰησοῦς Χρισ-
τός· ἀνάστηθι καὶ στρῶσον σεαυτῷ. καὶ εὐθέως ἀνέστη. 35 καὶ
εἶδαν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες Λύδδα καὶ τὸν Σαρῶνα,
οἵτινες ἐπέστρεψαν ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον. 36 ἐν Ἰόππῃ δέ τις ἦν
μαθήτρια ὀνόματι Ταβιθά, ἣ διερμηνευομένη λέγεται Δορκάς·
αὕτη ἦν πλήρης ἔργων ἀγαθῶν καὶ ἐλεημοσυνῶν ὧν ἐποίει.
37 ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἀσθενήσασαν αὐτὴν
ἀποθανεῖν· λούσαντες δὲ ἔθηκαν αὐτὴν ἐν τῷ ὑπερῴῳ. 38 ἐγγὺς
δὲ οὔσης Λύδδας τῇ Ἰόππῃ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἀκούσαντες ὅτι Πέτρος
ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῇ ἀπέστειλαν δύο ἄνδρας πρὸς αὐτὸν παρακαλοῦντες·
Μὴ ὀκνήσῃς διελθεῖν ἕως ἡμῶν. 39 ἀναστὰς δὲ Πέτρος
συνῆλθεν αὐτοῖς, ὃν παραγενόμενον ἀνήγαγον εἰς τὸ ὑπερῷον,
καὶ περιέστησαν αὐτῷ πᾶσαι αἱ χῆραι κλαίουσαι καὶ
ἐπιδεικνύμεναι χιτῶνας καὶ ἱμάτια ὅσα ἐποίει μετ' αὐτῶν οὖσα
ἡ Δορκάς. 40 ἐκβαλὼν δὲ ἔξω πάντας ὁ Πέτρος θεὶς τὰ γόνατα

𝔖, 𝔈: *om.* Γ 383, *vg.*, *Hier.* καί] + ἐκεῖθεν 𝔏gp, 𝔖vg, *Bl.* 31 αἱ . . . ἐκκλησίαι (+ πᾶσαι *E*) *E* δ, 𝔏gp *vg.*a, 𝔖ph, *Aug.*c : ἡ . . . ἐκκλησία, Γ, *vg.*, 𝔖vg, 𝔈 καὶ Γαλιλαίας *om. Cass. Chr.*: *del. Bl.* εἶχον . . . οἰκοδομούμεναι (-οι *E*) . . . πορευόμεναι (-οι *E*) . . . ἐπληθύνοντο *E* δ, 𝔏gp *vg.*a, 𝔖ph, *Aug.*c : εἶχεν . . . οἰκοδομουμένη . . . πορευομένη . . . ἐπληθύνετο *cett.* 32 πάντων] τῶν πόλεων 𝔖vg : πασῶν (*om. vg.*q) τῶν πόλεων καὶ χωρῶν 𝔏p *vg.*qw, *Bl.*: *om.* 𝔏g καὶ *om.* 𝔏gpt 34 ἀτενίσας . . . εἶπεν 𝔏p, 𝔈: καὶ εἶπεν *cett.* ἰᾶται] sanet 𝔏pt *vg.*w Ἰησοῦς] ὁ κύριος Ἰησ. *A*, 𝔏gpt *vg.*, 𝔈, *Amb.* (*om.* Χρ.) *Cass.* 35 οἵτινες] καί 𝔏h, 𝔖vg : καὶ πολλοί 𝔈 36 μαθήτρια] ἀδελφή 𝔈 : χήρα *spec.* Δόρκας] + ὃ καὶ Δαμάλη 𝔏p *vg.*q 37 ἀποθανεῖν] + cum autem esset Petrus Lyddae 𝔖ph αὐτὴν ἔθηκαν *CE* δ: ἔθηκαν *B* 38 παρακαλοῦντες] + καὶ λέγοντες *spec.* ὀκνήσῃς . . . ἡμῶν] ὀκνῆσαι . . . αὐτῶν δ, 𝔖 39 περιέστησαν 𝔏gp *vg.*, 𝔖, *spec.*: παρέστησαν Γ, 𝔈 ἱμάτια] + καὶ διηγοῦντο (+ αὐτῷ *spec.*) 𝔏p, *spec.* μετ' αὐτῶν οὖσα] αὐτοῖς 𝔏gt *vg.*, 𝔖vg : *om.* 𝔈vt 40 θείς δ, 𝔏gpt *vg.*, 𝔖ph, *spec.*: καὶ θείς *cett.*

προσηύξατο, καὶ ἐπιστρέψας πρὸς τὸ σῶμα εἶπεν· Ταβιθά,
ἀνάστηθι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. *ἡ δὲ*
παραχρῆμα *ἤνοιξεν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὸν*
Πέτρον ἀνεκάθισεν, 41 *δούς τε αὐτῇ χεῖρα ἀνέστησεν αὐτήν.*
καὶ φωνήσας τοὺς ἁγίους καὶ τὰς χήρας παρέστησεν αὐτὴν
ζῶσαν. 42 *γνωστὸν δὲ ἐγένετο καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰόππης, καὶ*
ἐπίστευσαν πολλοὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον. 43 *ἐγένετο δὲ αὐτὸν*
ἡμέρας ἱκανὰς μεῖναι ἐν Ἰόππῃ παρά τινι Σίμωνι βυρσεῖ.

X

1 *Ἀνὴρ δέ τις* ἦν *ἐν Καισαρείᾳ ὀνόματι Κορνήλιος, ἑκατοντ-*
άρχης ἐκ σπείρης τῆς καλουμένης Ἰταλικῆς, 2 *εὐσεβὴς*
καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν Θεὸν σὺν παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, ποιῶν τε
ἐλεημοσύνας πολλὰς τῷ λαῷ, καὶ δεόμενος τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ
παντός, 3 *εἶδεν ἐν ὁράματι φανερῶς ὡσεὶ περὶ ὥραν ἐνάτην*
τῆς ἡμέρας ἄγγελον τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελθόντα πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ
εἰπόντα αὐτῷ· Κορνήλιε. 4 *ὁ δὲ ἀτενίσας αὐτῷ*

καὶ ἔμφοβος γενόμενος εἶπεν· Τί ἐστιν, κύριε;
εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ· Αἱ προσευχαί σου
καὶ αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σου ἀνέβησαν
εἰς μνημόσυνον ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ.
5 *καὶ νῦν πέμψον ἄνδρας εἰς Ἰόππην*

40 ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (*om.* τοῦ κυρ. ἡμῶν 𝔈, *Cypr. Cass.*) Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ *vg.*^{a}, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, 𝔈, *Cypr. Amb. Cass., spec.*: *om. cett.* παραχρῆμα *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, 𝔈, *spec.*: *om. cett.* 41 δούς τε *A*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, *spec.*: δοὺς δέ *cett.* καὶ φων. 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg., spec.*: φων. δέ *cett.* 42 ἐγένετο] + τοῦτο $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, *spec.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ 43 αὐτόν *post* δέ *hab. AE*, *post* μεῖναι *C* δ: *om.* ℵ *B*
X 1 ἦν δ, *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈, *Hier. Cass.*: *om. cett.* σπείρας *B* 2 ποιῶν τε δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Iren.*: ποιῶν *cett.* ἐν τῷ λαῷ $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, 𝔖, *Iren. Cypr.* 3 εἶδεν] + οὖν *Iren.* ἐν ὁράματι *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: ἐν ὁράματι φανερῶς *om. Iren.*, *del. Bl.* ὡσεὶ περί] ὡσεί 383, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, *Chr.*: περί 𝔖, *Iren. Cypr.* τοῦ θεοῦ] τοῦ κυρίου $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ εἰπόντα αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σου (*med. om.*) *Iren.* 4 ὁ δὲ ἀτενίσας . . . εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ *om. Cypr.* σου *post* ἐλεημ. *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dp}$ εἰς μνημόσυνον *om.* ℵ, *Cass.* ἐνώπιον *CE* δ: ἔμπροσθεν ℵ *AB* 5 πέμψον ἄνδρας εἰς Ἰόππην καὶ μετάπεμψαι Σίμωνα] mitte ad Simonem *Iren.* (*med. om.*) Σίμωνα] + τινα *c.Th. ABC*, *vg.* τὸν ἐπικαλούμενον Πέτρον *E* δ 6 οὗτος] καὶ αὐτός 614: ὅς $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Bl.* ἐστιν ξενιζόμενος 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$,

καὶ μετάπεμψαι Σίμωνα
ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται Πέτρος·
6 οὗτός ἐστιν ξενιζόμενος παρά τινι Σίμωνι βυρσεῖ,
ᾧ ἐστιν οἰκία παρὰ θάλασσαν·
7 ὡς δὲ ἀπῆλθεν ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ λαλῶν αὐτῷ
φωνήσας δύο τῶν οἰκετῶν
καὶ στρατιώτην εὐσεβῆ
τῶν προσκαρτερούντων αὐτῷ
8 καὶ ἐξηγησάμενος τὸ ὅραμα αὐτοῖς
ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν Ἰόππην.
9 τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ὁδοιπορούντων ἐκείνων
καὶ τῇ πόλει ἐγγιζόντων,
ἀνέβη Πέτρος ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα
καὶ προσηύξατο περὶ ὥραν ἕκτην.
10 ἐγένετο δὲ πρόσπεινος
καὶ ἤθελεν γεύσασθαι·
παρασκευαζόντων δὲ αὐτῶν
ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἔκστασις,
11 καὶ θεωρεῖ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεῳγμένον,
καὶ τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς δεδεμένον
σκεῦός τι ὡς ὀθόνην λαμπρὰν
καθιέμενον **ἐξ οὐρανοῦ** ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,
12 ἐν ᾧ ὑπῆρχεν πάντα τὰ τετράποδα

Chr.: ξενίζεται Γ *E* 383 παρά . . . βυρσεῖ] πρὸς Σίμωνά τινα (*om.* τινα 𝔏^{dp}) βυρσέα 614, 𝔏^{dgp}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* ᾧ] οὗ 𝔏^{degp} *vg.*, *Bl.* θάλασσαν] + οὗτος λαλήσει σοι τί σε δεῖ ποιεῖν 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*^{a} 7 ἄγγελος] + τοῦ κυρίου 𝔏^{g} αὐτῷ] τῷ Κορνηλίῳ δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* δύο τῶν οἰκετῶν] + αὐτοῦ δ, 𝔏^{d} *vg.*, 𝔖 εὐσεβῆ] fidelem 𝔏^{d} 8 τὸ ὅραμα 𝔏^{dg}: ἅπαντα *cett.* αὐτοῖς *post* ἐξηγ. *hab.* *C* δ, 𝔏^{dg}: *om.* 𝔏^{p} 9 ἐκείνων *BC* 383: αὐτῶν ℵ *AE* 614 ἐγγιζόντων τῇ πόλει 𝔏^{dgp} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} καὶ προσηύξατο 𝔏^{dgp}: προσεύξασθαι *cett.* ἕκτην] + τῆς ἡμέρας *A*, 𝔏^{g} 10 γενόμενός τε πρόσπεινος καὶ θέλων 𝔏^{g} αὐτῶν] ἐκείνων δ: *om. const. Ap.*: *del. Bl.* ἐπέπεσεν (ἔπεσεν 383, *Clem.*) *cett. Clem. Cass.*: ἐγένετο Γ 11 καὶ τέσσαρσιν . . . ὀθόνην λαμπράν *c.Th.*, 𝔏^{dgp}, *Aug.*^{c} *Cass. const. Ap.*: καὶ καταβαῖνον (+ ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν δ) σκεῦός τι ὡς ὀθόνην μεγάλην τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς (+ δεδεμέναι και δ) *cett.* (𝔏^{p2}), *Orig.*: καὶ σκεῦός τι δεδ. τέσσ. ἀρχ. ὡς ὀθόνην μεγ. καταβαῖνον 𝔖, 𝔈: καί τι σκεῦος τέσσ. ἀρχ. ἐκδεδεμένον *Clem.* ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (οὐρανόθεν *Orig.* ½) 𝔏^{dp} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Orig. Aug. Cass.*: *om. cett. Clem.* 12 ἐν ᾧ] καί 𝔏^{d}

*καὶ ἑρπετὰ *τῆς γῆς* καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.*
13 *καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ πρὸς αὐτόν·*
Ἀναστάς, Πέτρε, θῦσον καὶ φάγε.
14 *ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἶπεν· Μηδαμῶς, Κύριε,*
ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔφαγον
πᾶν κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον.
15 *καὶ φωνὴ πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου πρὸς αὐτόν·*
Ἃ ὁ Θεὸς ἐκαθάρισεν, σὺ μὴ κοίνου.
16 *τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τρίς·*
καὶ ἀνελήμφθη πάλιν τὸ σκεῦος εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.
17 *ὡς δὲ ἐν ἑαυτῷ* ἐγένετο, *διηπόρει ὁ Πέτρος*
τί ἂν εἴη τὸ ὅραμα ὃ εἶδεν,
καὶ *ἰδοὺ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Κορνηλίου,*
ἐπερωτήσαντες τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ Σίμωνος,
ἐπέστησαν ἐπὶ τὸν πυλῶνα,
18 *καὶ φωνήσαντες ἐπυνθάνοντο*
εἰ Σίμων ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Πέτρος
ἐνθάδε ξενίζεται·
19 *τοῦ δὲ Πέτρου διενθυμουμένου*
περὶ τοῦ ὁράματος εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ Πνεῦμα·
Ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες ζητοῦσίν σε.

12 καὶ ἑρπετὰ τῆς γῆς Γ, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}: + καὶ τὰ θηρία *E*: τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ ἑρπετὰ (θηρία 𝔖^{ph}) καὶ τὰ θηρία (ἑρπετά 𝔖^{ph}) δ, 𝔖^{ph}: καὶ ἑρπετά 𝔏^{d}, *Orig.* $\frac{2}{4}$: καὶ τὰ θηρία *Aug.*^{c} τὰ πετεινά *CE* δ, *const. Ap.*: τὰ πτηνά *Clem.*: πετεινά ℵ *AB* 13 πρὸς αὐτόν] + λέγουσα *vg.*^{w}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Hier. const. Ap.* ἀνάστα 𝔏^{dg} *vg.*, 𝔖, *Clem. Aug. Hier.* (*om.* Πέτρε 𝔏^{g}, *Clem.*) θῦσον καὶ φάγε *cett. Aug.* $\frac{7}{8}$: quicquid in vase vides macte et manduca *Aug.* $\frac{1}{8}$ (*Faust.* xxxi. 3) *Bl.* 14 ὁ δὲ Πέτρος] ὁ δέ 𝔏^{d}, *Orig.*^{lat}: Πέτρος δέ *Clem.* μηδαμῶς . . . ἀκάθαρτον *cett. Clem. Aug.* $\frac{2}{3}$: Domine, commune et immundum non contingam *Aug.* $\frac{1}{3}$ (*Faust.* l. c.), *Bl.* ἤ *DCE* δ, *Orig.*: καί *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) *Clem. Aug. alii* 15 καὶ (+ ἡ *Clem.*) φωνή *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): φωνήσας δέ *D* ἐκ δευτέρου *post* πρὸς αὐτόν *hab.* 𝔖^{ph}, *Clem. Orig.*^{lat}: *om.* 𝔏^{g}, *const. Ap. Bl.* ἃ ὁ θεός . . . κοίνου *cett. Iren. Aug.* $\frac{3}{4}$: quod ego sanctificavi immundum ne vocaveris *Aug.* $\frac{1}{4}$ (*Faust. l. c.*) *Bl.* 16 πάλιν *post* ἀνελήμφθη *hab.* *D*, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔈^{vt}, *ante* ἀνελ. δ, 𝔏^{e}, 𝔖^{ph}: εὐθύς *ante* ἀνελ. *c. Th.* Γ *E*, *vg.*: *om.* 𝔏^{d}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈^{vg}, *Amb.* τὸ σκεῦος] omne vas *c. Th.* 17 ἐγένετο *D*, 𝔏^{p}: *om. cett. Cass.* καί *DCE* δ, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph}: *om. cett.* ἰδού] προσῆλθον 𝔖^{vg} ἀπὸ τοῦ (*om.* τοῦ *D*) *DAC* 383: ὑπὸ τοῦ ℵ *BE* 614 Κορνηλίου] + προσελθόντες

20 ἀλλὰ ἀναστὰς κατάβηθι, καὶ πορεύου σὺν αὐτοῖς
μηδὲν διακρινόμενος,
ὅτι ἐγὼ ἀπέσταλκα αὐτούς.
21 τότε καταβὰς ὁ Πέτρος πρὸς τοὺς ἄνδρας εἶπεν·
Ἰδοὺ ἐγώ εἰμι ὃν ζητεῖτε·
τί θέλετε, ἢ τίς ἡ αἰτία δι' ἣν πάρεστε;
22 οἱ δὲ εἶπον **πρὸς αὐτόν**·
Κορνήλιός **τις** ἑκατοντάρχης,
ἀνὴρ δίκαιος καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν Θεὸν
μαρτυρούμενός τε
ὑφ' ὅλου τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Ἰουδαίων,
ἐχρηματίσθη ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου ἁγίου
μεταπέμψασθαί σε εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ῥήματα παρὰ σοῦ.
23 τότε εἰσαγαγὼν **ὁ Πέτρος** ἐξένισεν αὐτούς.
τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ἀναστὰς
ἐξῆλθεν σὺν αὐτοῖς, καί τινες τῶν ἀδελφῶν
τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰόππης συνῆλθαν αὐτῷ.
24 τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καισάρειαν.
ὁ δὲ Κορνήλιος ἦν προσδεχόμενος αὐτούς,
καὶ συγκαλεσάμενος τοὺς συγγενεῖς αὐτοῦ
καὶ τοὺς ἀναγκαίους φίλους **περιέμεινεν.**

(προσῆλθον 𝔏^{p}) *c. Th.*, 𝔏^{p} ἐπερωτήσαντες *D*: διερωτ. Γ *E* δ Σίμωνος] + ἦλθον καί 𝔖^{vg} 19 δέ] + ἔτι 𝔏^{p} διενθυμουμένου] + καὶ διαπορoῦντος 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Bl.* αὐτῷ *post* πνεῦμα *hab.* ℵ *AC*, *vg.*: *om.* *B* ἄνδρες *D* δ, 𝔏^{p1}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Amb.* *Aug.*, *spec.*, *Ephr.*: + τρεῖς (δύο *B*) *cett.* (*c. Th.*) ζητοῦντες ℵ *B* (ἰδού . . . ἀλλά *om.* *Vig.*) 20 ἀνάστα *D*, 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*, *Aug.* μηδὲν διακρινόμενος *om.* *Aug.* $\frac{3}{3}$ *Vig.* (*cf.* xi. 12) 21 τότε καταβάς *DE*, 𝔖^{vg}: καταβὰς δέ *cett.* ὁ *DE*: *om.* Γ δ ἄνδρας] + τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους ἀπὸ τοῦ Κορνηλίου 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*^{qw} τί θέλετε *D*, 𝔖^{ph}: *om.* *cett.* ἤ *D*: *om.* *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) 22 πρὸς αὐτόν *D*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈: *om.* *cett.* τις *D*, 𝔖^{vg}: *om.* *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) τε *cett.* (*c. Th.*): *om.* 614, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph} ὑφ' *D*: ὑπό Γ *E* δ 23 τότε *DE*: οὖν (*post* εισ.) *cett.*: tunc ergo 𝔏^{d} εἰσαγαγών (ingressus 𝔏^{d}) *D*, 𝔏^{ep}, 𝔖^{vg}: εἰσκαλεσάμενος (προσκαλεσ. *E*) *cett.* ὁ Πέτρος *D*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈: *om.* *cett.* αὐτούς *post* ἐξέν. *hab.* *D*, 𝔖, *ante* ἐξέν. Γ δ, *ante* ὁ Πέτρος 𝔏^{p}, *om.* 𝔏^{g} ἀναστάς] + ὁ Πέτρος (*om.* ἀναστάς 383) *CE* δ, 𝔖^{ph} 24 καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον δ, *Chr.* εἰσῆλθεν *DB*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈: εἰσῆλθον *cett.* (*c. Th.*) Καισάρειαν *D* δ: τὴν Καισ. Γ *E* προσδεχόμενος *D*: προσδοκῶν Γ *E* δ αὐτόν 𝔏^{p} καί (*ante* συγκαλ.) *D*: *om.* *cett.* περιέμεινεν *D* *c. Th.*, 𝔏^{p1}: *om.* *cett.* (𝔏^{p2})

25 **προσεγγίζοντος δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου**
εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν
προδραμὼν εἷς τῶν δούλων
διεσάφησεν παραγεγονέναι αὐτόν.
ὁ δὲ Κορνήλιος ἐκπηδήσας
καὶ συναντήσας αὐτῷ
πεσὼν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας προσεκύνησεν **αὐτόν.**
26 ὁ δὲ Πέτρος *ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν λέγων·*
Τί *ποιεῖς; κἀγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι* **ὡς καὶ** *σύ.*
27 *καὶ εἰσελθών τε καὶ *συνομιλῶν αὐτῷ**
εὗρεν συνεληλυθότας πολλούς,
28 *ἔφη τε πρὸς αὐτούς·* Ὑ*μεῖς* **βέλτιον** *ἐπίστασθε,*
ὡς ἀθέμιστόν ἐστιν ἀνδρὶ Ἰ*ουδαίῳ κολλᾶσθαι*
ἢ προσέρχεσθαι ἀλλοφύλῳ·
κἀμοὶ ὁ Θ*εὸς ἐπέδειξεν μηδένα κοινὸν*
ἢ ἀκάθαρτον λέγειν ἄνθρωπον.
29 *διὸ καὶ ἀναντιρρήτως ἦλθον*
μεταπεμφθεὶς **ὑφ' ὑμῶν.**
πυνθάνομαι οὖν τίνι λόγῳ μετεπέμψασθέ με.
30 *καὶ ὁ* Κ*ορνήλιος ἔφη·* Ἀ*πὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας*
μέχρι τῆς ἄρτι ὥρας ἤμην **νηστεύων,**

25 *προσεγγίζοντος* (*εἰσελθόντος* 𝔖^{vg}) δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}: ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν τὸν Πέτρον *cett.* (𝔏^{p})   εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{qw}: *om. cett.* (𝔏^{g})   προδραμών . . . αὐτόν *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{g}: *om. cett.* (𝔏^{p})   ὁ δὲ Κορν. . . . αὐτῷ *D c.Th.*: συναντήσας (τότε συνήντησεν 𝔏^{g}) αὐτῷ ὁ Κορν. *cett.* (𝔏^{p})   πρός *D*: ἐπί Γ *E* δ   πόδας] + αὐτοῦ 𝔏^{dgpt} *vg.*, 𝔖   αὐτόν *D*, 𝔏^{pt} *vg.*^{aw}, 𝔈: *om. cett.*   26 ὁ δὲ Πέτρος . . . λέγων *cett.* (𝔏^{p2}): ἔλεγεν αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος 𝔏^{p1}, *Bl.*   τί ποιεῖς *D*: ἀνάστηθι Γ *E* δ, 𝔏^{gt}, 𝔖, 𝔈: τί ποιεῖς; (+ deum adora 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*^{q2w}) ἀνάστηθι *c.Th.*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q2w} κἀγώ *D* 383: ἐγώ 𝔏^{g}: ἐγὼ γάρ 𝔏^{p}: καὶ γὰρ ἐγώ *E* 614, 𝔖^{ph}: καὶ ἐγὼ (κἀγώ *A*) αὐτός Γ, *vg.*, 𝔈   ὡς καὶ σύ *DE*, 𝔏^{gpt} *vg.*^{aw}: *om. cett.* 27 καὶ εἰσελθών τε καί *D*: καὶ συνομιλῶν αὐτῷ εἰσῆλθεν καί *cett.* (*vocc.* συνομιλῶν αὐτῷ *videntur ex D post* τε καί *excidisse*)   εὗρεν *D*: εὑρίσκει Γ *E* δ   28 ὑμεῖς] αὐτοί *Iren.*   βέλτιον *D*, *Aug.*^{c}: *om. cett. Iren. Aug.* $\frac{3}{4}$ ἀθέμιστον *D*: ἀθέμιτον Γ *E* δ   προσέρχεσθαι *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) *Iren. Aug.*: + ἀνδρί *D*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 (*ex l. priore ?*)   κἀμοί] ἐμοὶ δέ 𝔏^{pt} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Iren. Aug.*   ὁ θεός *post* κἀμοί *hab. DB* δ, 𝔏^{gt}, 𝔖, *Iren. Cypr. Aug.*: *ante* μηδένα ℵ *AE*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*, *Orig.*   ἐπέδειξεν *D*: ἔδειξεν Γ *E* δ (dixit *Cypr.*) ἤ] καί *Cypr.*   29 ὑφ' ὑμῶν *DE*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q}, 𝔖, 𝔈: *om. cett.*   τίνι λόγῳ]

τὴν ἐνάτην τε προσευχόμενος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου,
καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ ἔστη ἐνώπιόν μου
31 ἐν ἐσθῆτι λαμπρᾷ, καί φησιν· Κορνήλιε,
εἰσηκούσθη σου ἡ προσευχὴ
καὶ αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σου
ἐμνήσθησαν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ.
32 πέμψον οὖν εἰς Ἰόππην, καὶ μετακάλεσαι Σίμωνα
ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται Πέτρος·
οὗτος ξενίζεται ἐν οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος
βυρσέως παρὰ θάλασσαν,
ὃς παραγενόμενος λαλήσει σοι.
33 ἐξαυτῆς οὖν ἔπεμψα πρός σε,
παρακαλῶν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ἡμᾶς,
σὺ δὲ καλῶς ἐποίησας **ἐν τάχει** παραγενόμενος.
νῦν ἰδοὺ πάντες ἡμεῖς
ἐνώπιόν σου ἀκοῦσαι **βουλόμενοι παρά σου**
τὰ προστεταγμένα σοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ.
34 ἀνοίξας δὲ τὸ στόμα Πέτρος εἶπεν·
Ἐπ' ἀληθείας καταλαμβάνομαι
ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολήμπτης ὁ Θεός·
35 ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει ὁ φοβούμενος αὐτὸν

quae est causa propter quam 𝔏^{g} 30 τετάρτης] τῆς τρίτης *D* τῆς ἄρτι ὥρας *D* : ταύτης τῆς ὥρας Γ *E* δ νηστεύων *cett.* : *om.* Γ, 𝔏^{p} *vg.* (ἤμην νηστεύων *ante* μέχρι *hab.* 𝔏^{g}) τὴν ἐνάτην τε *D* : τὴν ἐνάτην ℵ *BC*, *vg.* : καὶ τὴν ἐνάτην (+ ὥραν δ) *A* δ : ἀπὸ ἕκτης ὥρας ἕως ἐνάτης *E* (et hora nona in domo mea et ecce 𝔏^{g} *sine* προσευχόμενος) ἀνήρ] ἄγγελος *c. Th.* 31 φησιν] + μοι 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q}, 𝔖 ἡ προσευχή σου *E*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.* 32 ὅς . . . λαλήσει σοι (+ ἐξ ὧν σωθήσει *ex* xi. 14 𝔈) *D cett.* : *om.* Γ, 𝔏^{p2} *vg.* 33 παρακαλῶν . . . ἡμᾶς *D*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q}, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett.* δέ *D* : τε (γε *A*) *cett.* ἐν τάχει *D* : *om. cett.* παραγενόμενος] + πρὸς ἡμᾶς 𝔏^{t} *vg.*^{aw} ἰδού *D*^{2} (δου *D*^{1}) : καὶ ἰδού 𝔖^{vg} : οὖν ἰδού 𝔈, *Bl.* : οὖν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) σου *D*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : τοῦ θεοῦ *cett.* ἀκοῦσαι *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : πάρεσμεν ἀκοῦσαι *cett.* βουλόμενοι *D*, 𝔏^{gt}, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.* παρά σου (*ante* βουλ. 𝔏^{g}) *D*, 𝔏^{g} : *om. cett.* τά *D*, 𝔈 : πάντα τά *cett.* ἀπό *DAC* : ὑπό ℵ *B* δ : παρά *E* θεοῦ *D* 383, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : κυρίου *cett.* 34 τὸ στόμα Πέτρος *D*, 𝔏^{g} : Π. τὸ στόμα (+ αὐτοῦ *ACE* 383) *cett.* καταλαμβάνομαι *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) *Iren.* : -ανόμενος *D* : οἶδα *Eus.* 35 αὐτόν] τὸν θεόν 𝔏^{g}, *Hier.* $\frac{1}{3}$

καὶ ἐργαζόμενος δικαιοσύνην
δεκτὸς αὐτῷ ἐστιν.
36 τὸν **γὰρ** λόγον **ὃν** ἀπέστειλεν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ,
εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
οὗτός ἐστιν πάντων Κύριος.
37 ὑμεῖς οἴδατε τὸ γενόμενον *ῥῆμα* καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας,
Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲθ ὡς ἔχρισεν ὁ Θεὸς
Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει·
38 ἀρξάμενος **γὰρ** ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας,
μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐκήρυξεν Ἰωάννης,
οὗτος διῆλθεν εὐεργετῶν
καὶ ἰώμενος πάντας
τοὺς καταδυναστευθέντας ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου,
ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ·
39 καὶ ἡμεῖς μάρτυρες πάντων
ὧν ἐποίησεν ἔν τε τῇ χώρᾳ τῶν Ἰουδαίων
καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ· ὃν καὶ ἀνεῖλαν
κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου.
40 τοῦτον ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρεν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῆ γενέσθαι,
41 οὐ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, ἀλλὰ μάρτυσιν τοῖς
προκεχειροτονημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῖν,

36 γάρ *D* C^1 614, 𝔏^{pt}, 𝔖, 𝔈, *spec.* : *om. cett.* (𝔏^{d})   λόγον] + αὐτοῦ 614, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈, *spec.*   ὅν *D* ℵ *E* 383, 𝔖 : *om. cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *spec.*   κύριος *del. Bl.*   37 ὑμεῖς *om. B* : + οὖν 𝔏^{p} ῥῆμα *cett. Iren.* : *om. D*   τῆς Γ *E* δ : *om. D*   ὡς ἔχρισεν] ὃν ἔχρισεν *D*, 𝔏^{gpt}, 𝔖, *Aug. Vig.* : ὡς (ὅς 614) ἔχρισεν αὐτόν *cett. Iren.*   ἁγίῳ πνεύματι *D* : πνεύματι (ἐν πνεύμ. *E*) ἁγίῳ *cett.*   38 ἀρξάμενος (-ον δ) γάρ . . . Ἰωάννης *huc transposui*, *post* Ἰουδαίας *hab. codd.* : ἀρξάμενος . . . Γαλιλαίας *del. Bl.*   γάρ *DA*, 𝔏^{ep} *vg.*, *Iren.* : *om. cett.* (*E*), *Ambr. Hil.*   βάπτισμα] κήρυγμα *B*   οὗτος *D*, 𝔏^{gpt}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Vig.* : ὅς (ὡς ℵ 383) *cett.* : αὐτός *Iren.*   καταδυναστευθέντας *D*, *vg.*, 𝔖, *Iren.* : -αστευομένους *cett. Orig.*   διαβόλου *cett.* (𝔏^{e}) : Σατανᾶ *E*   μετ' αὐτοῦ] ἐν αὐτῷ *Vig.*, *prom.*   39 ἡμεῖς *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : ὑμεῖς *DA*   μάρτυρες] + ἐσμεν δ, 𝔏^{gp2t}, 𝔈   πάντων *cett. Iren.* : αὐτοῦ *D* (*ex l. sup.*) : αὐτοῦ πάντων 𝔖^{vg} Ἱερουσ. *DB*, 𝔏^{gpt} *vg.*, 𝔈 : ἐν Ἱερουσ. *cett. Iren.*   ὃν καί] ὅν 383, *vg.*, *Iren.*   ἀνεῖλαν *cett. Iren.* : + οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι 𝔖^{vg} : ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ ἀνεῖλαν 𝔏^{t}, 𝔖^{ph} (*simile habuit* 𝔏^{p}, *in quo voc.* Iudaei *exstat, cetera deleta sunt*)   40 μετὰ τὴν τρίτην ἡμέραν *D*, 𝔏^{t}

οἵτινες συνεφάγομεν
καὶ συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ **καὶ συνεστράφημεν**
μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν **ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα.**
42 καὶ ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν κηρῦξαι τῷ λαῷ
καὶ διαμαρτύρασθαι
ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ὡρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κριτὴς
ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν.
43 τούτῳ πάντες οἱ προφῆται μαρτυροῦσιν,
ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν λαβεῖν
διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ
πάντα τὸν πιστεύοντα εἰς αὐτόν.
44 ἔτι λαλοῦντος τοῦ Πέτρου τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα
ἔπεσεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἐπὶ πάντας
45 τοὺς ἀκούοντας τὸν λόγον. καὶ ἐξέστησαν
οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστοὶ
ὅσοι συνῆλθον τῷ Πέτρῳ,
ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη
ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Ἁγίου ἐκκέχυται·
46 ἤκουον γὰρ αὐτῶν λαλούντων
γλώσσαις **ἑτέραις** καὶ μεγαλυνόντων τὸν Θεόν.
εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος·
47 Μήτι τὸ ὕδωρ κωλῦσαί τις δύναται

αὐτόν *cett. Iren.*: αὐτῷ *D* 41 ἡμῖν *post* μάρτ. *hab.* $\mathfrak{L}^{t}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Iren.*: *ante* ὑπὸ *C*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ καὶ συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ *om. Vig.* καὶ συνεστράφημεν (*post* νεκρῶν *vg.*^{qw}) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ *vg.*^{qw}, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Vig.*: *om. cett. Iren. Aug.* ἀναστῆναι *D*: + αὐτόν Γ *E* δ (postea quam resurrexit (+ et *m.* 2) ascendit in caelum $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, *cf. Ephr.* quia mansit ille et deinde ascendit) ἡμέρας (δι' ἡμερῶν *E*) τεσσ. (*ante* μετά *hab.* $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ *vg.*^{w}, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Vig.*) *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ *vg.*^{aqw}, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Aug. Vig. Ephr.*: *om. cett. Iren.* 42 ἐνετείλατο *D*: παρήγγειλεν Γ *E* δ τῷ λαῷ *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, *Bl.* οὗτος *DBCE* 614, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: αὐτός *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *Iren.* 44 ἔπεσεν *DA*, *Chr.*: ἐπέπεσεν א *BE* δ, *Epiph.* λόγον] + τοῦ κυρίου $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ *vg.*^{q} 45 ὅσοι] οἵ *B*, $\mathfrak{L}^{dgp}$, *Hier. Aug. Vig.*, *reb.* τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ (*om.* τοῦ *D*) ἁγίου *DB*: τοῦ (*om.* א *E*) ἁγίου πνεύμ. א *AE* δ 46 γλώσσαις ἑτέραις] praevaricatis linguis $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ (*D eras.*): linguis variis *vg.*^{a}: una quaque lingua $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: aliis linguis $\mathfrak{E}$: γλώσσαις *cett.* μεγαλυνόντων *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *D eras.*: δοξαζόντων *c.Th.* εἶπεν δέ *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: τότε ἀπεκρίθη *cett. Hier.*, *reb.* 47 μήτι . . . τις *cett.* (τις *ante* δύναται *hab. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, *post* μήτι $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, *post* δύναται δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *ante* κωλῦσαι *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Hier.*): μήτις *Iren.*, *reb.* κωλῦσαι *om. E.*

τοῦ μὴ βαπτισθῆναι αὐτοὺς
οἵτινες τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἔλαβον
ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς;
48 τότε προσέταξεν αὐτοὺς βαπτισθῆναι
ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι **τοῦ Κυρίου** Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
τότε παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν **πρὸς αὐτοὺς** διαμεῖναι
ἡμέρας τινάς.

XI

1 Ἀκουστὸν δὲ ἐγένετο
τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς
τοῖς ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ
ὅτι καὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἐδέξατο τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ.
2 **ὁ μὲν οὖν Πέτρος διὰ ἱκανοῦ χρόνου**
ἠθέλησεν πορευθῆναι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα·
καὶ προσφωνήσας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς
καὶ ἐπιστηρίξας αὐτοὺς ⟨ἐξῆλθεν⟩, πολὺν λόγον
ποιούμενος διὰ τῶν χωρῶν,
διδάσκων αὐτούς· ὃς καὶ κατήντησεν αὐτοῖς
καὶ ἀπήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ.
ὅτε δὲ ἀνέβη Πέτρος εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα

47 τοῦ μὴ βαπτισθῆναι *om. Iren.* ½ αὐτούς *D*: τούτους *cett. Iren.* ὥσπερ *D*: ὡς Γ 614: καθώς *E* 383 48 τότε προσέταξεν *D*, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{vg}: προσ. δέ (τε *A*, *vg.*, *Hier.*) *cett.* βαπτισθῆναι *post* αὐτούς *hab.* *DE* δ, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{vg}, *reb.*; *post* Χριστοῦ Γ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *D*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}: τοῦ κυρίου 383: Ἰησ. Χριστοῦ *cett.*, *reb.* τότε (*om.* 𝔏^{g}) παρεκάλεσαν (+δέ 𝔏^{g}) . . . ἡμέρας τινάς *om. Hier.* (*ep.* 112) παρεκάλεσαν *D*: ἠρώτησαν Γ *E* δ πρὸς αὐτούς (apud eos) *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖, 𝔈: *om. cett.* διαμεῖναι *D*: ἐπιμεῖναι Γ *E* δ XI 1 ἀκουστὸν δὲ ἐγένετο *D*, 𝔖^{vg}: ἤκουσαν δέ *cett. Hier.* τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς *D*, 𝔖^{vg}: οἱ ἀπόστ. καὶ οἱ ἀδ. *cett. Hier.* τοῖς D^{2} (οἱ D^{1}), 𝔖^{vg}: οἱ ὄντες Γ *E* δ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ *D*: κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν Γ *E* δ ἐδέξατο *D*: ἐδέξαντο Γ *E* δ τοῦ θεοῦ] + καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεόν 𝔏^{gp2} *vg.*^{qw}: + καὶ εὐχαρίστουν τῷ θεῷ 𝔖^{ph} 2 ὁ μὲν οὖν . . . προσφωνήσας (-ῆσαι 𝔖^{ph}) . . . ἐπιστηρίξας αὐτούς (*om.* αὐτούς 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{w}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Bl.*), *D*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{qw}, 𝔖^{ph}: *om. cett. Hier.* ἐξῆλθεν 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{qw}, 𝔖^{ph}: *om. cett.* (*D*), *Hier.* πολὺν (+τε 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{qw}, *Bl.*) . . . διδάσκων αὐτούς *D*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{qw}: καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς 𝔖^{ph}: *om. cett. Hier.* ὃς καί . . .

οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς **ἀδελφοὶ** *διεκρίνοντο*

3 *πρὸς αὐτόν, λέγοντες*

ὅτι Εἰσῆλθες *πρὸς ἄνδρας ἀκροβυστίαν ἔχοντας*

καὶ συνέφαγες **σὺν** *αὐτοῖς.*

4 *ἀρξάμενος δὲ* Πέτρος *ἐξετίθετο αὐτοῖς*

τὰ καθεξῆς λέγων·

5 Ἐγὼ *ἤμην ἐν* Ἰόππῃ *πόλει προσευχόμενος*

καὶ εἶδον ἐν ἐκστάσει ὅραμα,

καταβαῖνον σκεῦός τι

ὡς ὀθόνην λαμπρὰν τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς

καθιεμένην ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,

καὶ ἦλθεν ἕως ἐμοῦ·

6 *εἰς ἣν ἀτενίσας κατενόουν*

καὶ εἶδον τετράποδα τῆς γῆς

καὶ θηρία καὶ ἑρπετὰ

καὶ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ·

7 *καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν λέγουσάν μοι·*

Ἀνάστα, Πέτρε, *θῦσον καὶ φάγε.*

8 *εἶπα δέ·* Μηδαμῶς, Κύριε,

ὅτι κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον

οὐδέποτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ στόμα μου.

τοῦ θεοῦ *D*: *om. cett. Hier.* ὅτε δὲ (καὶ ὅτε *E* δ, *Chr.*) ἀνέβη Πέτρος (*om.* Πετρ. 𝔏^{p1}, *Cass.*) εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα (Ἱερουσαλήμ Γ) *cett.*: *om. D* οἱ (+δέ *D*: *om.* 𝔏^{d}) ἐκ περιτ. ἀδελφοὶ διεκρ. πρὸς αὐτόν *D*: διεκρ. πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἐκ περιτ. (+ἀδελφοί 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{w}) *cett. Cass.* 3 τί 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, *Hier.* εἰσῆλθες (-εν *B* 614, 𝔖) *post* ἔχοντας *hab. E* δ, 𝔖, *Chr.* συνέφαγεν *B* 614, 𝔖 σὺν αὐτοῖς *D*: αὐτοῖς Γ *E* δ 4 ὁ Πέτρος δ τὰ καθεξῆς *D*: καθεξῆς Γ *E* 614 (*om.* 383): πάντα καθεξῆς 𝔏^{g} 5 Ἰόππῃ πόλει *D*: πόλει Ἰόππῃ *cett.* ἐν *om. D*^{1} λαμπράν *c.Th.*: λαμπρὰν (*del. m.* 2) μεγάλην 𝔏^{p}: *om.* 𝔖^{vg}: μεγάλην *cett.* (*D*) τέτρασιν *D* ἕως *D*: ἄχρι (-ις *E* δ) Γ *E* δ 6 κατενόουν καί *om.* 𝔏^{p1} τετράποδα *D*: τὰ τετρ. Γ *E* δ θηρία *Bl.*: τὰ θηρία *D* Γ *E* δ ἑρπετὰ καί *D*: τὰ ἑρπ. καὶ τά Γ *E* δ 7 καὶ ἤκουσα *D*, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{vg}: ἤκουσα δὲ καί (*om.* καί δ, 𝔖^{ph}) *cett.* φωνὴν λέγουσαν *D*: φωνῆς λεγούσης Γ *E* δ ἀνάστα *D*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.* 𝔖: ἀναστάς *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) 8 εἶπα *D*: εἶπον Γ *E* δ μηδαμῶς, κύριε] κύριε, σὺ οἶσθα *Orig.* $\frac{2}{2}$ οὐδέποτε *post* ὅτι *hab.* 614, 𝔖, *Orig.* ἢ *cett.* (*D*): καί 𝔏^{dgp}, 𝔖^{vg} εἰσῆλθεν] ἔφαγον οὔτε εἰσῆλθεν 𝔏^{p2}

9 ἐγένετο δὲ φωνὴ *ἐκ δευτέρου* ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ **πρός με·**
Ἃ ὁ Θεὸς ἐκαθάρισεν σὺ μὴ κοίνου.
10 τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τρίς,
καὶ ἀνεσπάσθη πάλιν ἅπαντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.
11 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐξαυτῆς τρεῖς ἄνδρες
ἐπέστησαν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν
ἐν ᾗ ἤμην, ἀπεσταλμένοι ἀπὸ Καισαρείας πρός με.
12 εἶπεν δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμά μοι συνελθεῖν αὐτοῖς
μηδὲν διακρίνοντα.
ἦλθον δὲ σὺν ἐμοὶ καὶ οἱ ἓξ ἀδελφοὶ οὗτοι
καὶ εἰσήλθομεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀνδρός·
13 ἀπήγγειλεν δὲ ἡμῖν
πῶς εἶδεν ἄγγελον ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ σταθέντα
καὶ εἰπόντα **αὐτῷ·** Ἀπόστειλον εἰς Ἰόππην,
καὶ μετάπεμψαι Σίμωνα
τὸν ἐπικαλούμενον Πέτρον,
14 ὃς λαλήσει ῥήματα πρός σε
ἐν οἷς σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκός σου.
15 ἐν δὲ τῷ ἄρξασθαί με λαλεῖν **αὐτοῖς**
ἔπεσεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἐπ᾿ αὐτοὺς
ὡς καὶ ἐφ᾿ ἡμᾶς ἐν ἀρχῇ·
16 ἐμνήσθην δὲ τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ Κυρίου ὡς ἔλεγεν·
Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι,
ὑμεῖς δὲ βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ.
17 εἰ οὖν τὴν ἴσην δωρεὰν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς *ὁ Θεὸς*

9 ἐγένετο *D*: ἀπεκρίθη *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) δέ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): *om.* *D*^{1} ἐκ δευτέρου (*ante* φωνή *B*) *cett.*: *om.* *D*, 𝔏^{p1}, *Bl.* πρός με (μοι *E* δ, *ante* φωνή) *DE* δ, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{vg} (+λέγουσα 𝔏^{p}): *om. cett.* 10 πάλιν ἀνεσπάσθη *E* δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* (*om.* πάλιν 𝔖^{vg}) 11 τρεῖς *om.* 𝔏^{p1}: δύο *Epiph.* ἤμην *E* δ, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈: ἦμεν *D* Γ (erant 𝔏^{d}) 12 μοι τὸ πνεῦμα *E* δ, 𝔖^{vg}, *Epiph.* (+τὸ ἅγιον 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q2}) μηδὲν διακρίνοντα (*ita* ℵ *E*, -ναντα *AB*, -νόμενον δ) *cett.*: *om.* *D*, 𝔏^{p1}, 𝔖^{ph} δέ (τε 𝔏^{d}) *om.* *D* καὶ οἱ ἕξ] καὶ ἕτεροι (*om.* οὗτοι) 𝔏^{p1} 13 δέ] τε *E* 383, 𝔖^{vg} ἄγγελον *D*: τὸν ἀγγ. Γ *E* δ αὐτῷ *om.* Γ, 𝔈^{vt} ἀπόστειλον] πέμψον *B* Ἰόππην] +ἄνδρας *E* δ, 𝔖^{ph} 15 αὐτοῖς *D*, 𝔏^{p}, *Aug.*: ἐκεῖ 𝔖^{vg}: *om. cett.*, *reb.* ἔπεσεν *D*: ἐπέπεσεν Γ *E* δ αὐτούς *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): αὐτοῖς *D* ὡς *D*: ὥσπερ Γ *E* δ 17 ὁ θεός *om.* *D*, 𝔖^{ph}, *Aug.*, *reb.* ἐγώ] +δέ *E* 383, 𝔖^{ph} τοῦ . . . ἅγιον *D*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*$^{aqw, boh}$, 𝔖^{ph}, *Aug.*: *om. cett. Hier.* πιστεύσασιν ἐπ᾿ αὐτῷ *D*:

ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν πιστεύσασιν ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
ἐγὼ τίς ἤμην δυνατὸς κωλῦσαι τὸν Θεὸν
τοῦ μὴ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον
πιστεύσασιν ἐπ' αὐτῷ;
18 *ἀκούσαντες δὲ ταῦτα ἡσύχασαν*
καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν Θεὸν *λέγοντες·*
Ἄρα *καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὁ* Θεὸς
μετάνοιαν εἰς ζωὴν ἔδωκεν.
19 *οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως*
τῆς γενομένης ἐπὶ τοῦ Στεφάνου
διῆλθον ἕως Φοινίκης
καὶ Κύπρου *καὶ* Ἀντιοχείας,
μηδενὶ τὸν λόγον λαλοῦντες
εἰ μὴ μόνοις Ἰουδαίοις.
20 *ἦσαν δέ τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν ἄνδρες* Κύπριοι
καὶ Κυρηναῖοι,
οἵτινες ἐλθόντες εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν
ἐλάλουν πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας,
εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν **Χριστόν.**
21 *ἦν δὲ χεὶρ* Κυρίου *μετ' αὐτῶν,*
πολύς τε ἀριθμὸς πιστεύσας
ἐπέστρεψεν ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον.
22 *ἠκούσθη δὲ ὁ λόγος εἰς τὰ ὦτα τῆς ἐκκλησίας*
*τῆς *οὔσης* ἐν* Ἱερουσαλὴμ *περὶ αὐτῶν,*
καὶ ἐξαπέστειλαν Βαρνάβαν

πιστ. ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ (*om.* Χρ. *vg.*^{w}) 𝔖^{ph}, *vg.*^{w}: πιστ. ἐν ὀνόματι Ἰησ. Χριστοῦ *vg.*$^{aq, boh}$: *om. cett.* (𝔏^{p}) *Hier.* 18 ἐδόξασαν (-ξαν *D*) *cett.*: ἐδόξαζον *AE* ἄρα] + γε *E* δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* μετάνοιαν *D*: τὴν μετάνοιαν Γ *E* δ ἔδωκεν εἰς ζωήν *E* 383, 𝔖^{vg}, *Ambst.* 19 ἐπί (sub 𝔏^{dg} *vg.*) *cett.*: ἀπό *D*: διά 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖, *Ephr.* τοῦ (*om. AE*) Στεφάνου *DAE*: Στεφάνῳ ℵ *B* δ: Στέφανον 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖, *Ephr.* Κύπρου] Τύρου 𝔏^{p} τὸν λόγον λαλ. *D*: λαλ. τὸν λόγον *cett.* μόνοις *D*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔈, *Cass.*: μόνον Γ *E* δ, 𝔖 20 πρός] καὶ πρός Γ, 𝔏^{p} *vg.* Ἕλληνας *DA*: Ἑλληνίστας *BE* δ (εὐαγγελίστας ℵ) Χριστόν *D*, *vg.*^{w}: *om. cett.* 21 ἦν δέ (τε 𝔏^{p2}) *D*, 𝔏^{p2}: καὶ (*om.* 𝔏^{p1}) ἦν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) πιστεύσας *DE* δ: ὁ πιστ. Γ (μετενόησεν καὶ ἐπίστευσεν 𝔏^{g}) 22 ἠκούσθη] pervenit 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*, 𝔈 τῆς οὔσης] τῆς *DA*: τοῖς 383 τὰ περί *E*, *Chr.* (περὶ αὐτῶν *ante* εἰς τὰ ὦτα *hab.* 𝔏^{g})

διελθεῖν *ἕως τῆς* Ἀντιοχείας·
23 ὃς *καὶ παραγενόμενος*
καὶ ἰδὼν τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ *ἐχάρη,*
καὶ παρεκάλει πάντας
τῇ προθέσει τῆς καρδίας προσμένειν τῷ Κυρίῳ,
24 *ὅτι ἦν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς*
καὶ πλήρης Πνεύματος Ἁγίου *καὶ πίστεως·*
καὶ προσετέθη ὄχλος ἱκανὸς τῷ Κυρίῳ.
25 **ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι Σαῦλός ἐστιν εἰς Ταρσὸν**
ἐξῆλθεν ἀναζητῶν αὐτόν,
26 *καὶ συντυχὼν παρεκάλεσεν*
ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν·
οἵτινες παραγενόμενοι ἐνιαυτὸν ὅλον
*συνεχύθησαν *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ,*
καὶ ἐδίδαξαν ὄχλον ἱκανόν,*
καὶ τότε *πρῶτον ἐχρηματίσαν ἐν* Ἀντιοχείᾳ
οἱ μαθηταὶ Χριστιανοί.
27 *ἐν ταύταις δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις*
κατῆλθον ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων
προφῆται εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν,
ἦν δὲ πολλὴ ἀγαλλίασις·
28 **συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν**

22 διελθεῖν *om.* Γ, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} τῆς *D* : *om.* Γ *E* δ 23 ὃς καί *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg} : ὅς *cett.* τοῦ *DE* δ, *Chr.*: τὴν τοῦ Γ τῇ προθέσει τῆς καρδίας *post* προσμένειν *hab.* 𝔏^{g} : *om.* 𝔈 ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ (εἰς τὸν κύριον 𝔏^{p1}) *B*, 𝔏^{gp2} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈 24 τῷ κυρίῳ *om.* *B*, *Bl.* 25 ἀκούσας δὲ (+ ὁ Βαρνάβας 𝔏^{p2}, *Cass.*) ὅτι Σαῦλός ἐστιν εἰς Ταρσὸν (Θαρσόν *D*) ἐξῆλθεν ἀναζητῶν (-τῆσαι 𝔏^{d}) αὐτόν *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{gp}, *Cass.* : ἐξῆλθεν δὲ εἰς Ταρσὸν (+ ὁ Βαρν. *E* δ, *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}) ἀναζητῆσαι (ἀναστῆσαι *B*) Σαῦλον *cett.* 26 καὶ (+ ὡς *D*) συντυχὼν παρεκάλεσεν ἐλθεῖν *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{p1} : καὶ εὑρὼν (+ αὐτόν 383, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖) ἤγαγεν (+ αὐτόν *E*, 𝔖) *cett.* (𝔏^{p2}) οἵτινες . . . ἐδίδαξαν (*om.* ἐν τῇ . . . ἐδίδαξαν *D*^{1}) ὄχλον ἱκανόν *D*, 𝔏^{p1}, 𝔖^{vg} : ἐγένετο δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ (*om.* καί *E* 383) ἐνιαυτὸν ὅλον (*om.* ὅλον *E*) συναχθῆναι ἐν (*om.* ἐν 383, 𝔏^{g}) τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ διδάξαι ὄχλον ἱκανόν *cett.* καὶ τότε πρῶτον ἐχρηματίσαν *D*, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug. Cass.* : χρηματίσαι τε πρώτως (-τον *AE* δ) *cett.* οἱ μαθηταὶ Χριστιανοί *D*, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug. Cass.*: τοὺς μαθητὰς Χριστιανούς (Χρη- ℵ) *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) 27 ἐν αὐταῖς *B* 614 ἦν δὲ πολλὴ ἀγαλλίασις *D*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{qw}, *Aug.* (*serm. Dom.* ii. 57) *Anon.*^{c} : *om. cett.* 28 συνεστραμμένων

ἔφη εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν ὀνόματι Ἄγαβος
σημαίνων διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος
λιμὸν μεγάλην μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι
ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην·
ἥτις ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου.
29 οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ καθὼς εὐποροῦντο ὥρισαν
ἕκαστος αὐτῶν εἰς διακονίαν πέμψαι
τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀδελφοῖς·
30 ὃ καὶ ἐποίησαν ἀποστείλαντες
πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους
διὰ χειρὸς Βαρνάβα καὶ Σαύλου.

XII

1 Κατ' ἐκεῖνον δὲ τὸν καιρὸν
ἐπέβαλεν τὰς χεῖρας Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς
κακῶσαί τινας
τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας **ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ.**
2 καὶ ἀνεῖλεν Ἰάκωβον
τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰωάννου μαχαίρᾳ.
3 καὶ ἰδὼν ὅτι ἀρεστόν ἐστιν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις
ἡ ἐπιχείρησις αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς πιστοὺς
προσέθετο συλλαβεῖν καὶ Πέτρον·

δὲ ἡμῶν *D*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{qw}, *Aug. Anon.*^{c} *Ado* : *om. cett.* ἔφη *D* : ἀναστὰς δέ (καὶ ἀναστάς 𝔏^{g} *vg.* : ἀναστάς 𝔏^{p}, *Aug. Anon.*^{c} *Ado*) *cett.* σημαίνων *D*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q}, *Anon.*^{c} : ἐσήμανεν (-μαινεν *B*, 𝔏^{d} *vg.*, *Aug.*) *cett.* μεγάλην] μέγαν *D*^{1} *E* δ, *Chr.* ἥτις] ὅστις δ, *Chr.* καὶ ἐγένετο *E* δ, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug. Anon.*^{c} *Ado* Κλαυδίου] + Καίσαρος *E* δ, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug. Anon.*^{c} *Ado* 29 οἱ δὲ μαθηταί (+ οἱ ὄντες ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{a}) *D*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : τῶν δὲ μαθητῶν *cett. Eus. Aug.* εὐποροῦντο] *D*, 𝔏^{p} : εὐπορεῖτό τις *cett.*, *Eus. Aug.* τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν] τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις κατοικοῦσιν *Aug.* (ἀδελφοῖς *ante* τοῖς κατοικ. *hab.* 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈 : *om. Eus.*) 30 ὃ καί . . . διὰ χειρός] qui et miserunt per manus *Aug.* (*om. med.*) XII 1 τὰς χεῖρας (+ αὐτοῦ 𝔏^{d}) *post* ἐπέβαλεν *hab. D*, 𝔖^{vg}, *post* βασιλεύς *cett.* ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ *D* 614, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{qw}, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett. Eus. Luc.* 2 καὶ ἀνεῖλεν *D*, 𝔖^{vg} : ἀνεῖλεν δέ *cett. Eus. Luc.* μαχαίρῃ Γ 3 καὶ ἰδών *D* δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, *Luc.* : ἰδὼν δέ *cett.* ἀρεστή *Zahn* (quod placeret hoc 𝔏^{d}, *Luc.*), *cf.* Mt. vi. 34, 2 Cor. ii. 6 ἡ ἐπιχείρησις αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς (+ ἁγίους καί 𝔏^{p}) πιστούς *D c. Th.*, 𝔏^{p1} : *om. cett. Luc.* τοῦ συλλαβεῖν *E*

ἦσαν δὲ αἱ ἡμέραι τῶν ἀζύμων·
4 *τοῦτον πιάσας ἔθετο εἰς φυλακὴν*
παραδοὺς τέσσαρσιν τετραδίοις στρατιωτῶν
φυλάσσειν, βουλόμενος
μετὰ τὸ πάσχα ἀναγαγεῖν αὐτὸν τῷ λαῷ.
5 *ὁ μὲν οὖν Πέτρος ἐτηρεῖτο ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ*
⟨ὑπὸ τῆς σπείρης τοῦ βασιλέως⟩·
πολλὴ δὲ προσευχὴ ἦν
ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ περὶ αὐτοῦ
ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.
6 *ὅτε δὲ ἤμελλεν προάγειν αὐτὸν*
ὁ Ἡρώδης, τῇ νυκτὶ ἐκείνῃ
ἦν ὁ Πέτρος κοιμώμενος
μεταξὺ δύο στρατιωτῶν
δεδεμένος ἁλύσεσιν δυσίν·
φύλακές τε πρὸ τῆς θύρας
ἐτήρουν τὴν φυλακήν.
7 *καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐπέστη* **τῷ Πέτρῳ,**
καὶ φῶς ἐπέλαμψεν τῷ οἰκήματι·
νύξας δὲ τὴν πλευρὰν τοῦ Πέτρου
ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν λέγων· Ἀνάστα ἐν τάχει.
καὶ ἐξέπεσαν αἱ ἁλύσεις ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ.
8 *εἶπεν δὲ ὁ ἄγγελος πρὸς αὐτόν·*
Ζῶσαι καὶ ὑπόδησαι τὰ σανδάλιά σου.
ἐποίησεν δὲ οὕτως.

3 αἱ *om.* ℵ *B* 4 τοῦτον *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.* : ὃν καί *cett.* εἰς φυλακήν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{e}$) : ἐν φυλακῇ *E* φυλάσσειν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, *Luc.* : + αὐτόν *cett.* 5 ἐτηρεῖτο] + ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ (*vel* ἐκτενῶς) 𝔈 ὑπὸ τῆς σπείρης τοῦ βασιλέως $\mathfrak{L}^{p1}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: *om. cett.* (*D*) πολλὴ δὲ προσευχή *D*, 𝔈 : προσευχὴ δέ *cett.* ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ *D* : ἐκτενῶς (-νής *AE* δ, 𝔖) γινομένη *cett.* : *om.* 𝔈 περὶ αὐτοῦ . . . πρὸς τὸν θεόν (+ περὶ αὐτοῦ *D*) *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: περὶ αὐτοῦ *B* : πρὸς τὸν θεόν . . . περὶ (ὑπέρ *E* δ) αὐτοῦ *cett. Luc.* ἀπό *D* : ὑπό Γ *E* δ 6 προάγειν (-αγαγεῖν *A*) *DE c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ *vg.* : προσάγειν (-αγαγεῖν *B*) ℵ *B*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ ὁ *ante* Ἡρώδ. *om. D* τε] δέ *D* 614 πρὸ τῆς θύρας *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{p1}$ 7 τῷ Πέτρῳ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, 𝔈 : αὐτῷ $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett. Luc.* ἐπέλαμψεν *D* : ἔλαμψεν Γ *E* δ (+ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, *Luc.*) τῷ οἰκήματι *D* : ἐν τῷ οἰκήματι (in illo loco $\mathfrak{L}^{dgp}$, *Luc. Bl.*) *cett.* νύξας *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.* : πατάξας *cett.* ἐν τάχει] + καὶ ἀνέστη $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$,

καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Περιβαλοῦ τὸ ἱμάτιόν σου
καὶ ἀκολούθει μοι.
9 καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἠκολούθει·
καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι ἀληθές ἐστιν
τὸ γινόμενον διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου,
ἐδόκει γὰρ ὅραμα βλέπειν.
10 διελθόντες δὲ πρώτην
καὶ δευτέραν φυλακὴν
ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν πύλην τὴν σιδηρᾶν
τὴν φέρουσαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν,
ἥτις αὐτομάτη ἠνοίγη αὐτοῖς,
καὶ ἐξελθόντες **κατέβησαν τοὺς ἑπτὰ βαθμοὺς**
καὶ προῆλθον ῥύμην μίαν,
καὶ εὐθέως ἀπέστη ὁ ἄγγελος ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ.
11 καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν ἑαυτῷ γενόμενος εἶπεν·
Νῦν οἶδα ὅτι ἀληθῶς ἐξαπέστειλεν Κύριος
τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξείλατό με
ἐκ χειρὸς Ἡρώδου
καὶ πάσης τῆς προσδοκίας
τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.
12 καὶ συνιδὼν ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν τῆς Μαρίας
τῆς μητρὸς Ἰωάννου
τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Μάρκου,
οὗ ἦσαν ἱκανοὶ συνηθροισμένοι
καὶ προσευχόμενοι.

Luc. Bl. αὐτοῦ *post* χειρῶν *hab. D*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈, *post* ἐξέπεσ. *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) 8 περιζῶσαι *E* 383, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.* ἐποίησεν δὲ οὕτως *post* καὶ ἀκολ. μοι *hab.* 𝔏^{p} 9 ἠκολούθει] + αὐτῷ *E* δ, *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈 διά] ὑπό *c. Th. A*, *Chr.* γάρ *D*, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{vg}: δέ (*om.* ℵ) *cett.* 10 διελθόντες . . . ἦλθον *cett.* (𝔏^{g}): διελθών . . . ἦλθεν *Luc.* φυλακήν *hoc loco hab. D*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, *Luc.*, *ante* καὶ δευτ. *cett.* τὴν φέρουσαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν *om.* 𝔖^{vg} ἠνοίγη] ἠνύγη *D* κατέβησαν τοὺς ἑπτὰ (*om.* ἑπτά 𝔏^{p}) βαθμοὺς καί *D*, 𝔏^{p}: *om. cett. Luc.* 11 καί] τότε *c. Th.*, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Bl.* γενόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ *E* 383, 𝔖, *Chr.* ὅτι ἀληθῶς *DE*, 𝔏^{p}, *Luc.*: ἀληθῶς ὅτι *cett.* (𝔏^{g}) ὁ Κύριος *B* 614, *Chr.* καὶ ἐκ πάσης *E*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Luc.* 12 καὶ συνιδών *D*: συνιδών τε (δέ *A*, 𝔏^{gp}) *cett.* τῆς Μαρίας] Μαρίας *E* δ, *Chr.* ἱκανοί] + ἀδελφοί 614, 𝔖 καὶ προσευχόμενοι *om.* 𝔏^{g}

13 κρούσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τὴν θύραν τοῦ πυλῶνος
προσῆλθεν παιδίσκη ὀνόματι Ῥόδη ὑπακοῦσαι·
14 καὶ ἐπιγνοῦσα τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ Πέτρου
ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς οὐκ ἤνοιξεν τὸν πυλῶνα,
εἰσδραμοῦσα δὲ ἀπήγγειλεν
ἑστάναι τὸν Πέτρον πρὸ τοῦ πυλῶνος,
15 οἱ δὲ ἔλεγον αὐτῇ· Μαίνῃ.
ἡ δὲ διϊσχυρίζετο οὕτως ἔχειν.
οἱ δὲ ἔλεγον **πρὸς αὐτήν**·
Τυχὸν ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ ἐστιν.
16 ὁ δὲ ἐπέμενεν κρούων·
ἐξανοίξαντες δὲ καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν
17 ἐξέστησαν. κατασείσας δὲ αὐτοῖς
τῇ χειρὶ ἵνα σιγῶσιν
εἰσῆλθεν καὶ διηγήσατο αὐτοῖς
πῶς ὁ Κύριος αὐτὸν ἐξήγαγεν ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς·
εἶπέν τε· Ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰακώβῳ
καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ταῦτα.
καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον.
18 γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας
ἦν τάραχος *οὐκ ὀλίγος* ἐν τοῖς στρατιώταις,
τί ἄρα ὁ Πέτρος ἐγένετο.
19 Ἡρώδης δὲ ἐπιζητήσας αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ εὑρὼν
ἀνακρίνας τοὺς φύλακας

13 αὐτοῦ] τοῦ Πέτρου *E* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Chr.* τοῦ πυλῶνος (foris $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *cett.*: *D legi non potest* (ἔξω *Wetstein*) προῆλθεν ℵ, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ *vg.* ὑπακοῦσαι (-ούουσα ℵ) *post* Ῥόδη *hab. D, ante* ὀνόματι *cett.* 14 ἤνοιξεν] + αὐτῷ *E* 614, 𝔖 τὸν πυλῶνα] τὴν θύραν *E* καὶ εἰσδραμοῦσα δέ *D*: ingressaque festinanter $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ τόν *om. D* πρὸς τὸν πυλῶνα 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *spec.* 15 ἔλεγον αὐτῇ (ad eam) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: πρὸς αὐτὴν εἶπον *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) ἔλεγον] εἶπαν *B* πρὸς αὐτήν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, 𝔈: *om.* Γ *E* δ, *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ τυχόν *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.* ἐστιν αὐτοῦ Γ 16 ὁ δέ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: ὁ δὲ Πέτρος *cett.* ἐξανοίξαντες *D*: ἀνοίξαντες Γ *E* δ καὶ ἰδόντες *D*: εἶδον *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) ἐξέστησαν D^{2}: καὶ ἐξέστησαν *cett.* (D^{1}) 17 ἵνα σιγῶσιν (σιγα‖ ‖σιν) *D*: σιγᾶν Γ *E* δ εἰσῆλθεν καί (introiens $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ *vg.*[q], 𝔖: *om. cett.* αὐτοῖς *om.* ℵ *A*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ αὐτόν *ante* ἐξήγ. *hab. D* ℵ *BE*, *ante* ὁ κύρ. *A*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *ante* ἐκ 383, *vg.*, *post* φυλ. 616 τε] δέ *D* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Chr.* τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καὶ Ἰακώβῳ $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ 18 οὐκ ὀλίγος *om. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, *Luc.* ἐγένετο] + ἢ πῶς ἐξῆλθεν $\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$ *vg.*[w], *Bl.*

ἐκέλευσεν ἀπαχθῆναι,
καὶ κατελθὼν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας
εἰς Καισάρειαν διέτριβεν.
20 ἦν γὰρ θυμομαχῶν Τυρίοις καὶ Σιδωνίοις·
οἱ δὲ ὁμοθυμαδὸν **ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων**
τῶν πόλεων παρῆσαν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα,
καὶ πείσαντες Βλάστον τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ κοιτῶνος αὐτοῦ
ᾐτοῦντο εἰρήνην
διὰ τὸ τρέφεσθαι τὰς χώρας αὐτῶν ἐκ τῆς βασιλικῆς.
21 τακτῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ
ὁ Ἡρώδης ἐνδυσάμενος ἐσθῆτα βασιλικὴν
καὶ καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος
ἐδημηγόρει πρὸς αὐτούς.
22 **καταλλαγέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῖς Τυρίοις**
ὁ δῆμος ἐπεφώνει·
Θεοῦ φωναὶ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπου.
23 παραχρῆμα δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπάταξεν ἄγγελος Κυρίου,
ἀνθ' ὧν οὐκ ἔδωκεν δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ,
καὶ **καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος,**
γενόμενος σκωληκόβρωτος
ἔτι ζῶν καὶ οὕτως ἐξέψυξεν.
24 ὁ δὲ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ηὔξανεν καὶ ἐπληθύνετο.
25 Βαρνάβας δὲ καὶ Σαῦλος
⟨**ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Παῦλος**⟩

19 ἀπαχθῆναι *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Luc. Cass.*: ἀποκτανθῆναι *D*, 𝔖 : ἀπαχθῆναι καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι 𝔈 διέτριβεν] + ἐκεῖ 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔈, *Luc.* 20 γάρ *D* : δέ *cett.* (+ Ἡρώδης *E* δ, *vg.*^{q}, *Chr.*) οἱ δὲ ὁμοθ. *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔈 : ὁμοθ. δέ (τε *Luc.*) *cett.* ἐξ . . . πόλεων (μερῶν 614) *D* 614, 𝔖^{ph} (*post* παρῆσαν 614, 𝔖^{ph}) : *om. cett.* τὸν βασιλέα *D* : αὐτόν *cett. Luc.* αὐτοῦ *D* (*om.* 𝔏^{d}) : τοῦ βασιλέως *cett.* τὰς χώρας (τὴν χώραν 𝔖) αὐτῶν *D*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔖, *Luc.* : αὐτῶν τὴν χώραν (πόλιν *E*) *cett.* ἐκ *D* : ἀπό Γ *E* δ 21 καὶ καθίσας *cett.* (𝔏^{g}) : καθίσας ℵ *B*, *vg.*, *Luc.* 22 καταλλαγέντος δὲ (*om.* δέ 𝔏^{d} *vg.*^{qw}) αὐτοῦ τοῖς Τυρίοις (αὐτοῖς 𝔖^{ph} : + καὶ Σιδωνίοις 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*^{qw}) *D*, 𝔏^{p2}, *vg.*^{qw}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* ὁ δῆμος 𝔏^{p}, *Born.* : ὁ δὲ δῆμος *cett.* (*D*) *Luc.* φωναί *D*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} : φωνή *cett.* 23 αὐτὸν ἐπάταξεν *D*, 616, 𝔏^{g} : ἐπάτ. αὐτόν *cett. Luc.* δόξαν *DE* δ : τὴν δόξαν Γ καταβάς . . . βήματος *D*, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* ἔτι ζῶν καὶ οὕτως *D* : *om. cett.* 24 τοῦ κυρίου *B* 25 ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Παῦλος 614, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett.* (*D*)

ὑπέστρεψαν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ
⟨**εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν,**⟩
πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν,
συμπαραλαβόντες τὸν Ἰωάννην
τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Μᾶρκον.

XIII

1 *ἦσαν δὲ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ*
κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν
προφῆται καὶ διδάσκαλοι,
ἐν οἷς Βαρνάβας καὶ Συμεὼν
ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Νίγερ,
καὶ Λούκιος Κυρηναῖος, Μαναήν τε Ἡρώδου
τοῦ τετράρχου σύντροφος, καὶ Σαῦλος.
2 *λειτουργούντων δὲ αὐτῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ*
καὶ νηστευόντων εἶπεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον·
Ἀφορίσατε δή μοι τὸν Βαρνάβαν καὶ Σαῦλον
εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς.
3 *τότε νηστεύσαντες*

25 ὑπέστρεψαν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : ἀπέστρεψεν *D*, reversus est *c.Th.* ἀπό] ἐξ *A*, *Chr.* : εἰς ℵ *B c.Th.*, 383, 𝔈^{vt} εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν *E*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{qw}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Cass.* : *om. cett.* (*D*) τὸν Ἰωάν. *D* : Ἰωάν. Γ : καὶ Ἰωάν. *E* δ, 𝔖^{ph} ἐπικαλούμενον ℵ *A*, 𝔏^{dg}, 𝔈 XIII 1 ἦσαν δέ] + τινες *E* δ 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ *om.* 𝔏^{p} (erant autem in ecclesia *med. om. Anon.*^{c}) κατά . . . ἐκκλησίαν] καθ' ἑκάστην ἐκκλ. 𝔏^{p}, *Bl.* : *fort.* ἐκεῖ *ante* ἐκκλησ. *supplendum* ἐν οἷς (in quo 𝔏^{d}) *D*, *vg.* : ὅ τε *cett.* Βαρνάβας] + et Saulus quibus imposuerant manus prophetae (*ex v.* 3) *Anon.*^{c} ἐπικαλούμενος *D* : καλούμενος Γ *E* δ Κυρηναῖος *D* : ὁ Κυρ. Γ *E* δ Μαναήν τε Ἡρώδου] qui manet usque adhuc *Anon.*^{c} (manet *ex* Manaen *ortum vid.* : *cf. v.* 31 ἄχρι νῦν εἰσιν) τοῦ τετράρχου] καὶ τετρ. *D* (et Ticius *Anon.*^{c}) καὶ Σαῦλος (Paulus 𝔏^{p1}) *om. Anon.*^{c} 2 νηστευόντων δέ . . . καὶ λειτουργ. 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Orig. Hier. Vig.* τῷ Κυρίῳ *cett.* (*Luc.*) : *om.* 𝔏^{g}, *Vig.* εἶπεν] + αὐτοῖς *E*, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Vig.* τὸν Βαρν. καὶ (+ τόν ℵ 383) Σαῦλ. (Παῦλ. 𝔏^{p}, *Anon.*^{c}, *Aug. Vig.*) *cett. Ambst. Aug. Hier. Vig.* : τὸν (+ τε *Orig.*) Παῦλ. (Σαῦλ. 𝔖^{vg}) καὶ τὸν Βαρν. 𝔖^{vg}, *Orig. Amb.* 3 τότε . . . χεῖρας αὐτοῖς] quibus impositis manibus *med. om. Anon.*^{c} πάντες *D* : *om. cett.*, *Amb. Hier.* ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς (*om.* αὐτούς Γ δ) *cett. Amb.* : *om. D*

καὶ προσευξάμενοι πάντες
καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς
ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς.
4 οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου
καταβάντες εἰς Σελεύκειαν,
ἐκεῖθεν ἀπέπλευσαν εἰς Κύπρον.
5 γενόμενοι δὲ ἐν τῇ Σαλαμῖνι
κατήγγειλαν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου
ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων·
εἶχον δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννην ὑπηρετοῦντα αὐτοῖς.
6 καὶ περιελθόντων αὐτῶν
ὅλην τὴν νῆσον ἄχρι Πάφου
εὗρον ἄνδρα τινὰ μάγον
ψευδοπροφήτην Ἰουδαῖον
ὀνόματι καλούμενον Βαριησοῦαν,
7 ὃς ἦν σὺν τῷ ἀνθυπάτῳ
Σεργίῳ Παύλῳ, ἀνδρὶ συνετῷ·
οὗτος συγκαλεσάμενος Βαρνάβαν καὶ Σαῦλον
ἐπεζήτησεν ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ.
8 ἀνθίστατο δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἑτοιμᾶς ὁ μάγος,

4 οἱ *D*: οὗτοι *E* δ *Chr.*: αὐτοί Γ ἐκπεμφθέντες] egressi $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: ἐξελθόντες *Bl.* τοῦ Πν. Ἁγίου *D*: τοῦ Ἁγίου Πν. Γ: τοῦ Πν. *E* 383, *Chr.*: ὑπὸ (ἀπὸ) τῶν ἁγίων $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, 𝔈, *Bl.* καταβάντες (+δέ *D*, τε *Bl.*) *D*: κατῆλθον (ἀπ- *A*) *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *Vig.* εἰς τὴν Σελ. *AE* δ, *Chr.* (½) ἐκεῖθεν *D*: κἀκεῖθεν 614, *Chr.* (½): ἐκεῖθέν τε (δέ *c.Th.* 383, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *cett.* εἰς τὴν Κύπρον *E* δ, *Chr.* 5 γενόμ. δέ *D*: καὶ γενόμ. *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) ἐν τῇ (*om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *D*: ἐν (εἰς ℵ) Γ *E* δ Σαλαμίνῃ ℵ *AE* κατήγγειλαν *D*, *Chr.*: -ελλον *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) κυρίου *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: θεοῦ *cett.* εἶχον δέ] ἔχοντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν *E* ὑπηρετοῦντα αὐτοῖς *D c.Th.* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, 𝔈: εἰς διακονίαν *E*: ὑπηρέτην *cett.* *Eus.* 6 καὶ περιελθόντων (+δέ *D*, *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) αὐτῶν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, *Luc.*: διελθόντες δέ *cett.* μάγον *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.* Ἰουδαῖον *om.* *Hier.* ὀνόματι καλούμενον *D*: ᾧ ὄνομα *cett.* Βαριησούα || *D*: Βαριησοῦς (-σοῦ ℵ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*: -σοῦν *A*, 614) Γ *E* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*: Bariesuam $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$: Bariesubam *Luc.*: Barshoma $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Ephr.* (Βαρισσοῦς, -ισοῦς, -ιησσοῦς *act. Barn.*): Berieu *Hier.* (*nom. Hebr.*): Barieu (Barihen $\mathfrak{L}^{p1}$) $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ *mg.*, *Beda*: *post* Βαρ. *add.* ὃ μεθερμηνεύεται ἕτοιμος (Ἐλύμας *E*) *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*^{w}, *Luc.* 7 συγκαλ. *D*: προσκαλ. Γ *E* δ ἐπεζήτησεν] καὶ ἐζήτησεν *D* 8 Ἑτοιμᾶς (-oemas $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, *Luc.*: -imas *Ambst.*) *D*, *Ambst.* *Luc.*: Ἐλύμας (-imas $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$) *cett.*

οὕτως γὰρ μεθερμηνεύεται
τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, ζητῶν διαστρέψαι
τὸν ἀνθύπατον ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως,
ἐπειδὴ ἥδιστα ἤκουεν αὐτῶν.
9 *Σαῦλος δέ, ὁ καὶ Παῦλος, πλησθεὶς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου*
10 *καὶ ἀτενίσας εἰς αὐτόν, εἶπεν·*
Ὦ πλήρης παντὸς δόλου
καὶ ῥᾳδιουργίας, υἱὲ διαβόλου,
ἐχθρὲ πάσης δικαιοσύνης,
οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς Κυρίου
τὰς **οὔσας** *εὐθείας;*
11 *καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ Κυρίου ἐπὶ σέ*
καὶ ἔσῃ τυφλὸς μὴ βλέπων τὸν ἥλιον ἕως καιροῦ.
καὶ εὐθέως ἔπεσεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἀχλὺς καὶ σκότος,
καὶ περιάγων ἐζήτει χειραγωγούς.
12 *ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ ἀνθύπατος*
τὸ γεγονὸς **ἐθαύμασεν**
καὶ *ἐπίστευσεν* **τῷ Θεῷ,**
ἐκπλησσόμενος ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ Κυρίου.
13 *ἀναχθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Πάφου οἱ περὶ Παῦλον*
ἦλθον εἰς Πέργην τῆς Παμφυλίας·
Ἰωάννης δὲ ἀποχωρήσας ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν
ὑπέστρεψεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.
14 *αὐτοὶ δὲ διελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Πέργης*

8 *οὕτως . . . αὐτοῦ del. Bl.* ἐπειδὴ (ὅτι *E*) ἥδιστα (ἡδέως *E*, 𝔖^{ph}) ἤκουεν αὐτῶν (αὐτῶν ἤκουεν *E*) *DE*, 𝔖^{ph} (*cf. Chr.* xxviii. 2 ὅρα πόσον ἔρωτα εἶχε διδασκαλίας ἐν ἀρχῇ ὢν τοσαύτῃ) : *om. cett. Hier. Luc.* 9 καὶ ἀτενίσας *DE* δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖 : ἀτενίσας Γ, *Hier. Luc.* 10 παντὸς δόλου καί *om.* 𝔖^{ph} ῥᾳδιουργίας *D*^{1} 383, 𝔏^{g}, *Luc. Orig.*^{lat} *Vig.* : πάσης ῥᾳδ. *cett.* (*D*^{2}) *Orig. Hier.* τοῦ Κυρίου ℵ *B* 383 οὔσας *D*, *Vig.* : *om. cett. Orig. Hier.* 11 ἡ *D* : *om.* Γ *E* δ ἕως *D* : ἄχρι Γ *E* δ καὶ εὐθέως *D* : παραχρῆμα δέ (τε ℵ *C*) Γ *E* δ (καὶ εὐθέως . . . σκότος *om. Luc.*) ἐπέπεσεν *CE* δ, *Chr.* ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν *om. B* 12 ἰδὼν δέ *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Luc.* : τότε ἰδών *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) *Hier. Vig.* ἐθαύμασεν καί (cum admiratione 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.*) *DE*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Luc. Vig. Ephr.* : *om. cett. Hier.* τῷ θεῷ *D* : *om. cett. Hier. Vig.* ἐκπλησσόμενος ἐπὶ *om.* 𝔖^{vg} 13 ἀναχωρήσας *E* 14 αὐτοὶ δέ] Παῦλος δὲ καὶ Βαρνάβας *E* ἐλθόντες ℵ *BC* τῆς Πισιδίας *D cett.* : τὴν Πισιδίαν Γ 15 πρὸς αὐτούς

παρεγένοντο εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν τῆς Πισιδίας,
καὶ εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν
τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων ἐκάθισαν.
15 *μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν τοῦ νόμου*
καὶ τῶν προφητῶν
ἀπέστειλαν οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι
πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγοντες·
Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, εἴ τις ἔστιν
ἐν ὑμῖν λόγος σοφίας,
πρὸς τὸν λαὸν λέγετε.
16 *ἀναστὰς δὲ ὁ Παῦλος*
καὶ κατασείσας τῇ χειρὶ εἶπεν·
Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεόν,
ἀκούσατε.
17 *ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου Ἰσραὴλ*
ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν,
καὶ τὸν λαὸν ὕψωσεν ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ
ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου,
καὶ μετὰ βραχίονος ὑψηλοῦ
ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐξ αὐτῆς,
18 *καὶ ἔτη τεσσεράκοντα ἐτροποφόρησεν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.*
19 *καὶ καθελὼν ἔθνη ἑπτὰ ἐν γῇ Χαναὰν*
κατεκληρονόμησεν τὴν γῆν τῶν ἀλλοφύλων,
20 *καὶ ἕως ἔτεσι τετρακοσίοις καὶ πεντήκοντα ἔδωκεν κριτὰς*

ante οἱ ἀρχ. *hab.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ τις *om.* *E* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Chr.* εἴ τις ἔστιν ἐν ὑμῖν λόγος σοφίας *scripsi* (*cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 8): εἴ τις ἔστιν λόγου σοφίας ἐν ὑμῖν παρακλήσεως *D*: εἴ τις (*om.* τις *E* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Chr.*) ἔστιν ἐν ὑμῖν λόγος παρακλήσεως Γ *cett.* 16 ὁ *D*: *om.* Γ *E* δ 17 Ἰσραήλ *om.* *E* δ, $\mathfrak{S}$, *Chr.* *Bl.* καὶ τὸν λαόν] διὰ (perpetuum $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ = propter) τὸν λαόν (+ καί 614, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$) *D* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ ἐν τῇ γῇ *D* Αἰγύπτῳ *DCE*, *Chr.* 18 ἔτη τεσσεράκοντα *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: ὡς (*om.* *E*) τεσσερακονταετῆ χρόνον *cett.* ἐτροποφόρησεν *D c.* *Th.* ℵ *B* δ, *vg.*: ἐτροφοφόρησεν *AC*, $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$ 19 ἐν γῇ Χαναὰν ἑπτά *E* κατεκληρ. αὐτοῖς *AC* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}$, *Chr.* τῶν ἀλλοφύλων *D*: αὐτῶν *cett.*: αὐτῶν τῶν ἀλλοφ. $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ 20 καὶ ἕως *D*: καί $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὡς *E* δ: ὡς *cett.* (*cf.* *Ios.* *Ant.* v. 1) ἔδωκεν (+ αὐτοῖς *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$) *DE* 383, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: καὶ ἔδωκεν (+ αὐτοῖς $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$) 614, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἔδωκεν Γ, *vg.*

ἕως Σαμουὴλ τοῦ προφήτου.
21 κἀκεῖθεν ᾐτήσαντο βασιλέα,
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς τὸν Σαοὺλ υἱὸν Κίς,
ἄνδρα ἐκ φυλῆς Βενιαμίν,
22 ἔτη τεσσεράκοντα· καὶ μεταστήσας αὐτὸν
ἤγειρεν Δαυὶδ αὐτοῖς εἰς βασιλέα,
ᾧ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας·
Εὗρον Δαυὶδ τὸν υἱὸν Ἰεσσαί,
ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου,
ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου.
23 ὁ Θεὸς οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος **αὐτοῦ**
κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν
ἤγειρεν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ σωτῆρα τὸν Ἰησοῦν,
24 προκηρύξαντος Ἰωάννου
πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ
βάπτισμα μετανοίας
παντὶ τῷ λαῷ Ἰσραήλ.
25 ὡς δὲ ἐπλήρου Ἰωάννης τὸν δρόμον, ἔλεγεν·
Τίνα με ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ·
ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται μετ' ἐμέ οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἄξιος
τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν λῦσαι.
26 ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραὰμ
καὶ οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεόν,

20 τοῦ *DE* δ : *om.* Γ   21 ὁ θεός *om.* 383, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{a}, *Chr. Bl.*   ἐκ φυλῆς *om.* 𝔏^{g} 22 Δαυίδ *D* : τὸν Δαυίδ Γ *E* δ   αὐτοῖς *ante* Δαυ. *hab. ACE* 383, *vg.*, 𝔖   εἰς βασιλέα] τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί *vg.*^{w} *Bl.* (*mire*)   τὸν υἱόν *D* : τὸν τοῦ Γ *E* δ   ἄνδρα . . . μου *om.* *E*^{1} : ἄνδρα *om.* *B*   23 ὁ θεὸς οὖν (autem 𝔏^{d}) *D* : τούτου ὁ θεός *cett.*   ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος *om.* ℵ   ἀυτοῦ *D* : *om. cett.*   ἤγειρεν *DC* 614, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, 𝔈 : ἤγαγεν ℵ *ABE* 383   τῷ Ἰσραήλ] τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Ἰσρ. 𝔏^{g} τὸν Ἰησοῦν *D* : Ἰησοῦν Γ *E* 614 (*om.* 383)   24 παντὶ τῷ λαῷ] τῷ λαῷ *A* : τῷ 383   Ἰσραήλ *om.* 𝔈 : *post* Ἰσρ. *add.* εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν *vg.*^{qw} 25 ἔλεγεν] + πρὸς τὸν λαόν 𝔈^{vt} τίνα] τί ℵ *AB*, 𝔈   με *DE* δ, *Chr.* : ἐμέ Γ   ἐγώ] + ὁ Χριστός *E*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{a} ἀλλά *D*   26 Ἀβραάμ] + καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ *vg.*^{qw} *Bl.*   καί *om.* *B*, 𝔏^{g} θεόν] + ἀκούσατε *E*   ὑμῖν] ἡμῖν *DA*   ἡμῖν] ὑμῖν *CE*, 𝔏^{gt} *vg.*, 𝔖   ἀπεστάλη *E* δ   27 ἐν *om.* *CE*, 𝔏^{gt} *vg.*, *Chr.*   αὐτῆς *D*, 𝔏^{gt} *vg.* : αὐτῶν *cett.*   μὴ συνιέντες τὰς γραφάς 𝔏^{d} (*D eras.*) : τοῦτον ἀγνοήσαντες καὶ τὰς φωνάς (γραφάς *E*, 𝔖^{vg}) *cett.*   κρίναντες (καὶ κρίν. *D*) *del. Bl.*   ἐπλήρωσαν] reprobaverunt 𝔏^{p}, respuerunt 𝔏^{t} : τοῦτον ἀπεδοκίμασαν

ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἐξαπεστάλη.
27 οἱ γὰρ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ
καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῆς
μὴ συνιέντες τὰς γραφὰς τῶν προφητῶν
τὰς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας
κρίναντες ἐπλήρωσαν.
28 καὶ μηδεμίαν αἰτίαν θανάτου
εὑρόντες **ἐν αὐτῷ**
κρίναντες αὐτὸν παρέδωκαν Πιλάτῳ
29 εἰς ἀναίρεσιν· ὡς δὲ ἐτέλουν
πάντα τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένα,
ᾐτοῦντο τὸν Πιλᾶτον τοῦτον μὲν σταυρῶσαι
* * * * * *
⟨σταυρωθέντος δὲ ᾐτοῦντο τὸν Πιλᾶτον
ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου καθελεῖν αὐτόν·⟩
καὶ ἐπιτυχόντες πάλιν
καὶ καθελόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου
ἔθηκαν εἰς μνημεῖον.
30–1 ὃν ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρεν. οὗτος ὤφθη
τοῖς συναναβᾶσιν αὐτῷ
ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐφ᾽ ἡμέρας πλειονας·
οἵτινες **ἄχρι** νῦν εἰσιν μάρτυρες αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν λαόν.
32 καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελιζόμεθα
τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας **ἡμῶν**,

Bl. 28 ἐν αὐτῷ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gt}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: *om. cett.* κρίναντες (+autem $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) αὐτόν *D*: *om. cett.* παρέδωκαν Πιλάτῳ *D*: ᾐτήσαντο (-σαν τόν ℵ) Πιλᾶτον *cett.* εἰς (*praem.* ἵνα) ἀναίρεσιν *D*: ἀναιρεθῆναι αὐτόν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) 29 ὡς δέ] et $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$ ἐτέλουν *D*: ἐτέλεσαν Γ *E* δ γεγραμμένα] + εἰσιν *D* (scripta sunt $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) ᾐτοῦντο . . . μὲν (*om.* μέν $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) σταυρῶσαι *D*: *om. cett.* τὸν δὲ Βαραββᾶν ἀπολῦσαι *post* σταυρῶσαι *suppl. Bornemann* σταυρωθέντος . . . καθελεῖν αὐτόν *c.Th.*: *om. cett.* (*D*) καὶ ἐπιτυχόντες πάλιν *D*: ἐπέτυχον *c.Th.*: *om. cett.* καὶ καθελ. *D c.Th.*: καθελ. *cett.* ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου (σταυροῦ *E*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$) *cett.*: αὐτόν *c.Th.* ἔθηκαν] + αὐτόν *c.Th.*, *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}$: καὶ ἔθηκαν *D* 30 ὃν ὁ θεός (quem deus vero $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ὁ δὲ θεός *cett.* ἤγειρεν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ἤγειρεν αὐτόν (αὐτὸν ἤγ. *E*, *Chr.*) ἐκ νεκρῶν (+ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ *vg.*) *cett.* 31 οὗτος (hic qui $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: ὅς *cett.* (*E*) ἐφ᾽ ἡμ. πλείονας *hoc loco hab. D*: ἐπὶ ἡμ. πλείους *post* ὤφθη *hab. cett.* συναναβαίνουσιν D^{1} ἄχρι *D* 614, *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: *om. cett.* νῦν εἰσιν] εἰσιν *BE* 383: εἰσιν νῦν ℵ, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ 32 ἡμῶν *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Amb.*: *om. cett. Hil.*

γενομένην ἐπαγγελίαν,
ὅτι ταύτην ὁ Θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκεν
τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῶν,
ἀναστήσας **τὸν Κύριον** Ἰησοῦν **Χριστόν**·
33 οὕτως γὰρ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται·
Υἱός μου εἶ σύ,
ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.
αἴτησαι παρ' ἐμοῦ
καὶ δώσω σοι ἔθνη
τὴν κληρονομίαν σου,
καὶ τὴν κατάσχεσίν σου
τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς.
34 ὅτε δὲ ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν
μηκέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστρέφειν
εἰς διαφθοράν, οὕτως εἴρηκεν
ὅτι Δώσω ὑμῖν
τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά.
35 καὶ ἑτέρως λέγει·
Οὐ δώσεις τὸν ὅσιόν σου
ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν.
36 Δαυὶδ γὰρ ἰδίᾳ γενεᾷ
ὑπηρετήσας τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ βουλῇ ἐκοιμήθη
καὶ προσετέθη πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αὐτοῦ
καὶ εἶδεν διαφθοράν.

32 γενομ. ἐπαγγελίαν *D*, *Hil.* : ἐπαγγελίαν γενομ. *cett.* *Amb.*   αὐτῶν 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈 : αὐτῶν ἡμῖν *E* δ, 𝔖 : ἡμῶν *cett.* (*D*)   τὸν κύριον . . . ὅτε δὲ ἀνέστησεν (*v.* 34) *om.* 𝔏^{g} τὸν κύριον Ἰησ. Χριστόν *D*, 𝔈, *Amb.* : τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησ. 614, 𝔖^{ph}, *Hil.* : αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν A^{2} (*in ras.*) : Ἰησοῦν *cett.*   33 οὕτως γάρ *D* : ὡς καί (*om.* καί 𝔏^{g}, *Amb.*) *cett.*   ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *Orig.* *Hil.* (*Psalmos* i et ii *continuant Iustin.* *Tert.* *Cypr.*) : ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγρ. τῷ δευτέρῳ (τῷ δευτ. γέγρ. *E* 614, 𝔖^{ph}, *vg.*) *cett.* *Amb.*   αἴτησαι . . . γῆς *D* *c.Th.*, *vg.*^{a} : *om.* *cett.* *Hil.*   34 ὅτε *D* 614, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{a}, *Hil.* : ὅτι *cett.*   αὐτόν] + ὁ θεός *E*, 𝔖^{vg} μέλλοντα] + αὐτόν *E*, *Chr.*   35 καὶ ἑτέρως *D* : διότι (διό *CE* δ, *Chr.*) καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ (alias 𝔏^{g} *vg.*) *cett.* : et rursus dixit in loco alio 𝔖^{vg} 36 γάρ *D*, *vg.*, 𝔈 : μὲν γάρ *cett.*   37 ἤγειρεν] + ἐκ νεκρῶν *vg.*   38 διὰ τούτου] διὰ τοῦτο B^{1} : δι' αὐτοῦ *E* (*add.* Ἰησοῦ 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{a}, 𝔈)   39 καί *om.* ℵ *AC*, *Aug.*   μετάνοια (*ante*

37 ὃν δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρεν οὐκ εἶδεν διαφθοράν.
38 γνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω ὑμῖν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί,
ὅτι διὰ τούτου ὑμῖν
ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν καταγγέλλεται·
39 καὶ **μετάνοια** ἀπὸ πάντων
ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε
ἐν νόμῳ Μωσέως δικαιωθῆναι.
ἐν τούτῳ **οὖν** πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιοῦται **παρὰ Θεῷ.**
40 βλέπετε οὖν μὴ ἐπέλθῃ
τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις·
41 Ἴδετε, οἱ καταφρονηταί, καὶ θαυμάσατε
καὶ ἀφανίσθητε, ὅτι ἔργον ἐργάζομαι ἐγὼ
ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν,
ὃ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε
ἐάν τις ἐκδιηγήσεται ὑμῖν.
καὶ ἐσίγησαν.
42 ἐξιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν παρεκάλουν
εἰς τὸ ἑξῆς σάββατον
λαληθῆναι αὐτοῖς τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα.
43 λυθείσης δὲ τῆς συναγωγῆς
ἠκολούθησαν πολλοὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων
καὶ τῶν σεβομένων προσηλύτων
τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ,
⟨ἀξιοῦντες βαπτισθῆναι,⟩

καταγγ. 𝔖ph, *ante* ὑμῖν *vg.*a) *D*, *vg.*a, 𝔖ph : *om. cett. Aug.* τῷ νόμῳ *E* δ οὖν (enim 𝔏d) *D c.Th.* 614 : *om. cett. Aug.* παρὰ (+τῷ δ) θεῷ (κυρίῳ 𝔏t) *D c.Th.* δ, 𝔏t : *om. cett. Aug.* 40 ἐπέλθῃ] +ἐφ' ὑμᾶς *ACE* 383, *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈 προφήταις] +εἰς ὑμᾶς 614 41 ἴδετε] ἀκούσατε *E* καὶ θαυμάσατε] καὶ θαυμάσατε ἐπιβλέψατε *E* : καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε (ἐμβλ. *Chr.*) καὶ θαυμ. δ, 𝔖ph, *Chr.* (=LXX) ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι *CE* δ, 𝔖ph, *Chr.* (=LXX) : ὃ ἐγὼ ἐργάζ. ἐγώ ℵ ὅ *DE* 614, 𝔏g, 𝔖 (= LXX) : ἔργον ὅ (ᾧ 383) *cett.* ἐκδιηγήσεται *D* (*cf.* viii. 31) : ἐκδιηγῆται Γ *E* δ (= LXX) καὶ ἐσίγησαν (-εν 614, 𝔖ph) *D* 614, 𝔖ph : *om. cett.* 42 παρεκάλουν *om. BE* ἑξῆς *D* : μεταξύ Γ *E* δ σάββατον] +ἠξίουν *B* τά *om. D* 43 δέ] +αὐτοῖς ℵ σεβομένων] +τὸν θεόν *E*, *vg.*a, 𝔖 Βαρνάβᾳ *D* : τῷ Βαρν. Γ *E* δ (τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρν. *om.* 𝔖vg) ἀξιοῦντες βαπτισθῆναι δ, 𝔖ph : *om. cett.* (*D*), *cf. Chr.* xxx. 1, διὰ τί αὐτοὺς οὐκ ἐβάπτισεν εὐθέως;

οἵτινες προσλαλοῦντες αὐτοῖς
ἔπειθον αὐτοὺς προσμένειν τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ.
ἐγένετο δὲ καθ' ὅλης τῆς πόλεως
διελθεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ.
44 *τῷ δὲ ἐχομένῳ σαββάτῳ*
σχεδὸν ὅλη ἡ πόλις συνήχθη ἀκοῦσαι **Παύλου,**
45 **πολύν τε λόγον ποιησαμένου** *περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου*
ἰδόντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τὸ πλῆθος
ἐπλήσθησαν ζήλου,
καὶ ἀντέλεγον τοῖς **λόγοις**
ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου λεγομένοις,
ἀντιλέγοντες καὶ *βλασφημοῦντες.*
46 *παρρησιασάμενοί τε ὁ Παῦλος καὶ Βαρνάβας*
εἶπαν **πρὸς αὐτούς·**
*Ὑμῖν πρῶτον ἦν *ἀναγκαῖον* λαληθῆναι τὸν λόγον τοῦ* **Θεοῦ.**
ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀπωθεῖσθε αὐτὸν
καὶ οὐκ ἀξίους κρίνετε ἑαυτοὺς
τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς
ἰδοὺ στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη.
47 *οὕτως γὰρ ἐντέταλκεν ὁ Κύριος·*
Ἰδοὺ *φῶς τέθεικά σε τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*

43 αὐτοῖς *om.* *E* δ ἐγένετο δὲ καθ' ὅλης τῆς πόλεως (κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν *E*) διελθεῖν (φημισθῆναι *E*, *vg.*^{qw}) τὸν λόγον *D c.Th. E*, *vg.*^{qw} : *om. cett.* τοῦ θεοῦ (domini 𝔏^{d}) *D* : *om. cett.* 44 δέ] τε *BE*, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* ἐχομένῳ *AC*^{2}*E*^{1} : ἐρχομένῳ ℵ *BC*^{1}*DE*^{2} δ ὅλη *D* : πᾶσα Γ *E* δ 44–5 Παύλου, πολύν τε (*om.* τε 𝔏^{d}) λόγον ποιησαμένου περὶ τοῦ κυρίου *D* : τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ (κυρίου ℵ *A*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔈) *cett.* 45 ἰδόντες *Bl.* : καὶ ἰδόντες *D*, 𝔖^{vg} : ἰδόντες δέ *cett.* τὸ πλῆθος *D*, 𝔈 : τοὺς ὄχλους (turbam 𝔏^{d}) *cett.* τοῖς λόγοις (+ τοῖς *E*, *Bl.*) *DE*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.* τοῦ *DCE*, *Chr.* : *om.* ℵ *AB* δ λεγομένοις *DC* δ, *Chr.* : λαλουμένοις ℵ *ABE* ἀντιλέγοντες (ἐναντιούμενοι *E*, 𝔏^{g}) καί *DE* δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett.* 46 παρρησιασάμενος *D* τε] δέ *E* δ, 𝔏^{d}, 𝔖, *Chr.* : τότε 𝔏^{eg} *vg.* Βαρν. *D* : ὁ Βαρν. Γ *E* δ πρὸς αὐτούς *D* 𝔈 : *om. cett.* πρῶτον ἦν ἀναγκαῖον (*om.* ἀναγκ. *D*) *D*, *Ambst. Cypr.* : ἦν ἀναγκαῖον πρῶτον *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) δέ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : *om. DAB* 383 (*m.* 1), 𝔈 ἀπωθεῖσθε] repulistis (respuistis) 𝔏^{dg}, *Ambst. Cypr. Hier. Cass.* καὶ οὐκ . . . ζωῆς *om. Aug.* $\frac{2}{3}$, *Cass.* κρίνετε] κρίνατε *D* : ἐκρίνατε 𝔏^{dg}, *Aug. Cypr. alii* τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς *om. Orig.* $\frac{4}{4}$: αἰωνίου *om.* 𝔈 στρεφόμεθα] + ἡμεῖς *E*, *Ambst.* 47 ἐντέταλκεν (+ ἡμῖν 𝔏^{d}) *D* : ἐντέταλται ἡμῖν

τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.
48 *καὶ ἀκούοντα τὰ ἔθνη ἔχαιρον,*
καὶ ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ,
καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι
εἰς ζώην αἰώνιον.
49 *καὶ διεφέρετο ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου*
δι' ὅλης τῆς χώρας.
50 *οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι παρώτρυναν*
τὰς σεβομένας γυναῖκας τὰς εὐσχήμονας
καὶ τοὺς πρώτους τῆς πόλεως.
καὶ ἐπήγειραν **θλῖψιν μεγάλην**
καὶ *διωγμὸν ἐπὶ Παῦλον καὶ Βαρνάβαν,*
καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν.
51 *οἱ δὲ ἐκτιναξάμενοι τὸν κονιορτὸν*
τῶν ποδῶν **αὐτῶν** *ἐπ' αὐτοὺς*
κατήντησαν εἰς Ἰκόνιον·
52 *οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπληροῦντο χαρᾶς*
καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου.

XIV

1 *ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν Ἰκονίῳ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ*

(ἡμῖν ἐντ. δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph}) *cett. Aug.*^{c} *Cass.*: scriptura dixit 𝔈: dixit per scripturam *Cypr.*: praecepit nobis . . . sicut scriptum est 𝔖^{vg} ἰδού *DE*, *Cypr.*: *om. cett. Aug.*^{c} φῶς τέθεικά σε τοῖς ἔθνεσιν *D*, *Cypr.*: τέθεικά (δέδωκά LXX) σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν (ἔθνεσιν 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, *Aug.*^{c} *Hier.*) *cett. Aug.*^{c} *Hier. Tert.*   σωτηρίαν] + τοῖς ἔθνεσιν 𝔖^{ph}: + ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν 614   48 καὶ ἀκούοντα *D*, 𝔏^{g}: ἀκ. δέ *cett. Aug.*^{c} ἐδέξαντο *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *Aug.*^{c}: ἐδόξαζον *cett.*   τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ (κυρίου ℵ *AC*, 𝔏^{de} *vg.*, *Chr.*) *cett.*: τὸν θεόν δ, 𝔖   ἐπίστευσαν] + τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ κυρίου δ, 𝔖^{ph} 49 καὶ διεφ. *D*: διεφ. δέ Γ *E* δ   50 παρώτρυνον *D*   τὰς σεβομένας] aliquas de colentibus deum 𝔏^{g}, *Bl.*   γυναῖκας τάς *cett.* (𝔏^{g}): γυν. καὶ τάς ℵ *E* δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *vg.*   θλῖψιν μεγάλην (*om.* μεγ. *E*) καί *DE* (*cf.* fecerunt tribulationem magnam *Ephr.*): *om. cett.*   Παῦλον *D* ℵ *B* 614: τὸν Π. *ACE* 383, *Chr.*   αὐτῶν *om. B*   51 τῶν] ἀπὸ τῶν 614, 𝔏^{dg}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.*   αὐτῶν *om.* Γ, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.*   εἰς αὐτούς *E*   κατήντησαν *D*: ἦλθον Γ *E* δ   εἰς τὸ Ἰκόν. *E* 614   52 δέ] τε *AB*, 𝔖^{vg}, *vg.*   XIV 1 ἐν Ἰκονίῳ *om.* 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈   κατὰ τὸ αὐτό] κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός 𝔈: *om.* 𝔖^{vg} (et venerunt et ingressi sunt synagogam 𝔖^{vg})

εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοὺς
εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων
καὶ λαλῆσαι οὕτως **πρὸς αὐτοὺς** *ὥστε πιστεύειν*
Ἰουδαίων τε καὶ Ἑλλήνων πολὺ πλῆθος.
2 **οἱ δὲ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων**
καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες
ἐπήγειραν **διωγμὸν κατὰ τῶν δικαίων**
καὶ ἐκάκωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐθνῶν
κατὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν.
ὁ δὲ Κύριος ἔδωκεν ταχὺ εἰρήνην.
3 *ἱκανὸν μὲν οὖν χρόνον διέτριψαν*
παρρησιαζόμενοι ἐπὶ τῷ Κυρίῳ
τῷ μαρτυροῦντι τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ,
διδόντι σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα γίνεσθαι
διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν.
4 *ἦν δὲ ἐσχισμένον τὸ πλῆθος τῆς πόλεως,*
καὶ οἱ μὲν ἦσαν σὺν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις,
ἄλλοι δὲ σὺν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις **κολλώμενοι**
διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

1 *αὐτούς cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : *αὐτόν D*   *τῶν Ἰουδαίων om.* ℵ   *πρὸς αὐτούς* (*ante οὕτως E*) *DE*, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.*   *πιστεύειν D* : *πιστεῦσαι* Γ δ : *θαυμάσαι E* : *om.* 𝔈^{vt} *πλῆθος*] + *καὶ πιστεῦσαι E*   2 οἱ δὲ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων *D* : οἱ δὲ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι (seniores *Ephr.*) *c.Th.*, *Ephr.* : οἱ δὲ ἀπειθήσαντες (-θοῦντες *E* δ) Ἰουδαῖοι *cett.*   *καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες* (+ *τής συναγωγῆς D*) *D c.Th.* : *om. cett.*   *ἐπήγειραν cett.* (*c.Th.*) : *ἐπήγαγον D*   *διωγμὸν* (+ *αὐτοῖς D*, *om.* 𝔏^{d}) *κατὰ τῶν δικαίων D*, *Ephr.* : *διωγμόν c.Th. E* δ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{aw}, 𝔖^{ph} : *τὰ ἔθνη* 𝔖^{vg} : *om.* Γ, 𝔈   ὁ δὲ κύριος (*θεός E*, *vg.*^{a}) *ἔδωκεν* (*ἐποίησεν E*) *ταχὺ* (*om E*) *εἰρήνην D c.Th. E*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*^{aqw}, *Cass.* : *om.* Γ δ, *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈
3 *διέτριψαν* (+ *ἐκεῖ E*, 𝔖, 𝔈) *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : *διατρίψαντες* (+ *ἐκεῖ* 𝔏^{g}) *D*, 𝔏^{g} *παρρησιασάμενοι D*, 𝔏^{g} *ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ* ℵ *A*, 𝔖^{vg} *αὐτῶν cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : *αὐτοῦ D*
4 *ἦν δὲ ἐσχισμένον D* : *ἐσχίσθη δέ* Γ *E* δ   *πλῆθος*] tota multitudo 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg} *ἄλλοι δέ D* : *οἱ δέ* Γ *E* δ   *κολλώμενοι . . . θεοῦ D c.Th.* : et ex illis adhaerebant apostolis 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.*   5–6 *καὶ πάλιν . . . καὶ Δέρβην c.Th.* : *ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο ὁρμὴ τῶν ἐθνῶν τε* (*om. τε D* 383, *Chr.*) *καὶ Ἰουδαίων σὺν τοῖς ἄρχουσιν αὐτῶν ὑβρίσαι καὶ λιθοβολῆσαι αὐτοὺς* (*αὐτούς post ὑβρίσαι hab. E* : -runt eos et lapidaverunt 𝔏^{h}, *qui hic redit* : et iniuriaverunt et lapidaverunt eos 𝔏^{d}) *συνιδόντες* (+ *καί D*) *κατέφυγον εἰς τὰς πόλεις τῆς Λυκαονίας* (+ *εἰς D* : + sicut Iesus dixerat iis LX[XII] 𝔏^{h} *sec. Buch.*)

5 ⟨**καὶ πάλιν ἐπήγειραν διωγμὸν**⟩
ἐκ δευτέρου οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι σὺν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν,
καὶ λιθοβολήσαντες ἐξέβαλον αὐτοὺς
6 *ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ φυγόντες ἦλθον*
εἰς τὴν Λυκαονίαν
εἰς πόλιν τινα καλουμένην
Λύστραν, καὶ Δέρβην,
καὶ τὴν περίχωρον **ὅλην,**
7 *κἀκεῖ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι ἦσαν,*
καὶ ἐκινήθη ὅλον τὸ πλῆθος ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ.
ὁ δὲ Παῦλος καὶ Βαρνάβας
διέτριβον ἐν *Λύστροις.*
8 *καί τις ἀνὴρ ἐκάθητο ἀδύνατος τοῖς ποσὶν*
ἐκ κοιλίας τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ,
ὃς οὐδέποτε περιπεπατήκει·
9 *οὗτος ἤκουσεν τοῦ Παύλου λαλοῦντος,*
ὑπάρχων ἐν φόβῳ·
ἀτενίσας δὲ αὐτῷ **ὁ Παῦλος,**
καὶ ἰδὼν ὅτι ἔχει πίστιν τοῦ σωθῆναι,

Λύστραν καί Δέρβην cett. (*D*) 6 *καὶ τὴν περίχωρον ὅλην DE*, *vg.*, *etiam* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *sec. Berg.* (et omnes confines regionis *sec. Buch.*) : *καὶ τὴν περίχωρον cett.* : *om. c.Th.* (?) 7 *ἦσαν εὐαγγ. CE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, *Chr.* (+*τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ E*) *καὶ ἐκινήθη* (*ἐξεπλήσσετο E*) *ὅλον τὸ πλῆθος* (*πᾶσα ἡ πολυπληθία E*) *ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ* (+*αὐτῶν E*) *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp2}$ *vg.*^{qw}, *Cass.* : *om. cett.* ὁ δὲ Παῦλος . . . Λύστροις *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$ *vg.*^{qw} : *om. cett.* 8 *καί τις . . . ποσίν D* : illic fuit quidam infirmus sedens langui[dus pedibus] $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *καί τις ἀνὴρ ἀδύν. ἐν Λύστροις* (*ἐν Λύστ. om. E*, 𝔈, *ante ἀδύν. hab. AC*) τοῖς *ποσὶν ἐκάθητο χωλός* Γ *E*, 𝔈 : *καί τις ἀνὴρ ἐν Λύστ. ἐκάθητο ἀδύν.* τοῖς *ποσὶν χωλὸς ἔτι* (*om. ἔτι* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, 𝔖) δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, 𝔖 *ἐκ κοιλίας . . . οὐδέποτε*] qui a ventre matris numquam $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *τῆς μητρός D* : *μητρός* Γ *E* δ *περιπεπατήκει DE* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *vg.*, 𝔖 : *περιεπάτησεν* Γ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: +[habens ti]morem dei $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ (*ita Berg.* : dei *om. Buch.*) 9 *οὗτος*] +libenter $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *ἡδέως Bl.* *ἤκουσεν* (*-κουεν BC*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, 𝔈) τοῦ Π. λαλοῦντος (λέγοντος ℵ) *cett.* : cum audisset (= *ἀκούσας*) P. loquentem credidit $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Bl.* *ὑπάρχων ἐν φόβῳ D*, *cf.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ (*supr.*) : *om. cett.* *ἀτενίσας δὲ αὐτῷ D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *ἠτένισεν αὐτῷ* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, 𝔈 : *πρὸς ὃν ἀτενίσας E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *ὃς ἀτενίσας αὐτῷ* Γδ, *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ ὁ Παῦλος *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.* *ἰδών*] cognovit $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: sciens 𝔈 *πίστιν ἔχει E* δ, *Chr.*

10 εἶπεν μεγάλῃ φωνῇ·
Σοὶ λέγω ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
ἀνάστηθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου
ὀρθὸς **καὶ περιπάτει.**
καὶ εὐθέως ἀνήλατο καὶ περιεπάτει.
11 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι ἰδόντες ὃ ἐποίησεν Παῦλος
ἐπῆραν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτῶν Λυκαονιστὶ λέγοντες·
Οἱ θεοὶ ὁμοιωθέντες τοῖς ἀνθρώποις
κατέβησαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς.
12 ἐκάλουν δὲ τὸν Βαρνάβαν Δία,
τὸν δὲ Παῦλον Ἑρμῆν,
ἐπειδὴ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ ἡγούμενος τοῦ λόγου.
13 οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ὄντος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως
ταύρους **αὐτοῖς** καὶ στέμματα
ἐπὶ τοὺς πυλῶνας ἐνέγκαντες
σὺν τοῖς ὄχλοις ἤθελον ἐπιθύειν.
14 ἀκούσαντες δὲ Βαρνάβας καὶ Παῦλος,
διαρρήξαντες τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν
ἐξεπήδησαν εἰς τὸν ὄχλον

10 εἶπεν] clamans dixit 𝔏^{h} (?) *teste Buch.* φωνῇ] τῇ φωνῇ *E* δ σοὶ . . . Χριστοῦ *D c.Th. CE* δ, 𝔏^{hpl} *vg.*^{w}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Ambr. Iren. Cass.*: *om.* ℵ *AB*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph} κυρίου] + ἡμῶν *E*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 (*add.* fili dei 𝔏^{h} (?) *teste Buch.*) ὀρθῶς *c.Th. E* 383 : *om.* 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 καὶ περιπάτει *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{h} : *om. cett.* εὐθέως] εὐθέως παραχρῆμα *D*, *Bl.* : statim eadem hora *c. Th.*: παραχρῆμα *E*: confestim 𝔏^{h} *sec. Berger* (ille infirmus *sec. Buch.*): *om. cett.* ἀνήλατο *D* : ἥλατο Γ 11 δέ] τε Γ 614 (*de* 𝔏^{h} *incert.*) τήν *om. D* αὐτῶν *om.* ℵ, 𝔏^{gh} τοῖς *D* : *om.* Γ *E* δ 12 δέ *D*, 𝔏^{eg}, *Chr.*: *om.* 383, 𝔏^{d} : τε *cett.* (*E*) τὸν Βαρν. Γ 614 : Βαρν. *D* : τὸν μὲν Βαρν. *E* 383, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* (*de* 𝔏^{h} *incert.*) Δίαν *DE* ἐπειδή . . . λόγου] quoniam ipse erat princeps verborum 𝔏^{h} *teste Buch.* (*om. Berg.*, *del. Bl.*) 13 οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς . . . ἐνέγκαντες . . . ἤθελον *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *Ephr.*: ὅ τε (δέ *E* δ, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈) ἱερεύς . . . ἐνέγκας . . . ἤθελεν *cett.* (et [ad portam] erat sacerdos Iovis tauros et diademata e[t coronas] adduxit ad ianuas cum plebe 𝔏^{h} *teste Buch.*) τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ὄντος] τοῦ ὄντος Διός *D*, *Bl.* : οἱ ὄντες τοῦ Διός 𝔏^{dg} τῆς πόλεως] πόλεως *D* αὐτοῖς *post* ταύρ. *hab. D*, *ante* ταύρ. 383, *post* στέμμ. *E* 614, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph}: *post* ἐπιθ. *vg.*^{w}, 𝔖^{vg}: *om.* Γ, 𝔏^{h} (?) *vg.* ἐπιθύειν *D* : θύειν Γ *E* δ 14 ἀκούσας *D* Βαρν. καὶ Παῦλ. *D*, 𝔏^{gh}, 𝔖^{vg} (+ ταῦτα 𝔏^{h}): οἱ ἀπόστολοι Βαρν. καὶ Παῦλ. *cett.* καί ἐξεπήδησαν *D*,

15 *κράζοντες καὶ φωνοῦντες·*
Ἄνδρες, τί ταῦτα ποιεῖτε ;
ἡμεῖς ὁμοιοπαθεῖς ἐσμὲν ὑμῖν ἄνθρωποι,
εὐαγγελιζόμενοι ὑμῖν **τὸν Θεὸν**
ὅπως ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν ματαίων
ἐπιστρέψητε ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν ζῶντα,
τὸν ποιήσαντα τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν
καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς·
16 *ὃς ἐν ταῖς παρῳχημέναις*
γενεαῖς εἴασεν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη
πορεύεσθαι ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν.
17 *καίγε οὐκ ἀμάρτυρον ἀφῆκεν ἑαυτὸν*
ἀγαθοποιῶν, οὐρανόθεν ὑμῖν
ὑετοὺς διδοὺς καὶ καιροὺς καρποφόρους,
ἐμπιμπλῶν τροφῆς καὶ εὐφροσύνης
18 *τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν. καὶ ταῦτα λέγοντες*
μόγις κατέπαυσαν τοὺς ὄχλους
τοῦ μὴ θύειν αὐτοῖς
⟨ἀλλὰ πορεύεσθαι ἕκαστον εἰς τὰ ἴδια⟩.

𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg} 15 *καὶ φωνοῦντες D* : dicebant 𝔏^{h} : *καὶ λέγοντες Γ E δ* : *om.* 𝔏^{g} *ἡμεῖς D*, 𝔏^{gh}, *Iren.* : *καὶ ἡμεῖς cett.* *ὑμῖν ἐσμεν C δ*, 𝔏^{g}, *Iren.* *ὑμῖν D*, 𝔏^{gh} *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈, *Iren. Ephr. alii* : *ὑμᾶς Γ E δ* *τὸν θεόν* (+ *τὸν ἀληθῆ Aug.*) *D, Iren. Aug. Ephr., spec.* : *om. cett.* *ὅπως . . . ἐπιστρέψητε* (-*στρέφητε E*) *DE* : . . . *ἐπιστρέφειν Γ δ* *τῶν ματαίων*] vanis simulacris *Iren.* *τὸν θεόν D δ, Chr.* : *θεόν Γ E* : *om.* 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.* *ζῶντα* (*τὸν ζ.* ℵ *δ Chr.*) *cett. Iren.* : *om.* 𝔏^{h} (+ *καὶ ἀληθῆ* 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*^{w}) *τὸν ποιήσαντα D*, 𝔏^{h} : *ὃς ἐποίησεν Γ E δ* 16 *ὅς*] *ὁ D* *πάντα cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : *κατά D* *ἔθνη*] + *τῶν ἀνθρώπων* 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.* (*cf. Ephr.* permisit filiis hominum) 17 *καίγε DE* : *καίτοι ABC* : *καίτοιγε* ℵ *δ* *ἀφῆκεν ἑαυτόν D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖, *Aug.* : *αὐτὸν* (*ἑαυτ. C δ*) *ἀφῆκεν cett. Iren.* *ἀγαθοποιῶν DE δ, Chr.* : *ἀγαθουργῶν Γ* : sed magis benefecit 𝔏^{h} *οὐρανόθεν ὑμῖν* (*ἡμῖν δ, αὐτοῖς* 𝔖^{vg}, *om. vg.*) *ὑετοὺς διδούς* (*διδ. ὑετούς* ℵ *A*, *vg., Iren.*) *cett. Iren.* : *ὑμῖν οὐρ. διδοὺς ὑετ.* 𝔏^{g} : *διδοὺς ὑμῖν ὑετ. οὐρανόθεν* 𝔏^{h} *τάς om.* D^{1} ℵ *ὑμῶν*] *ἡμῶν A* 383, 𝔏^{g} *vg.* : *αὐτῶν* 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Aug.* 18 *λέγοντες*] *εἰπόντες c. Th.* 614 *μόγις* (et 𝔏^{d}) *D* : *μόλις Γ E δ* *κατέπαυσαν*] . . . aserunt 𝔏^{h} : *ἔπεισαν Bl.* *τοὺς . . . αὐτοῖς*] ne immolarent sibi illi homines 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.* (ne quis sacrificaret ipsis 𝔖^{vg}) *ἀλλά . . . ἴδια c. Th. C δ*, 𝔏^{h} : *om. cett.* (*D*)

19 **διατριβόντων δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ διδασκόντων**
ἐπῆλθόν **τινες** *Ἰουδαῖοι*
ἀπὸ Ἰκονίου καὶ Ἀντιοχείας
⟨καὶ διαλεγομένων αὐτῶν παρρησίᾳ
ἔπεισαν τοὺς ὄχλους ἀποστῆναι ἀπ' αὐτῶν
λέγοντες ὅτι οὐδὲν ἀληθὲς λέγουσιν,
ἀλλὰ πάντα ψεύδονται⟩.
καὶ ἐπισείσαντες τοὺς ὄχλους
καὶ λιθάσαντες τὸν Παῦλον
ἔσυραν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως,
νομίζοντες τεθνάναι αὐτόν,
20 *κυκλωσάντων δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτὸν*
⟨καὶ ἀπελθόντος τοῦ ὄχλου
ἑσπέρας γενομένης⟩
ἀναστὰς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν.
καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον ἐξῆλθεν
σὺν τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ εἰς Δέρβην.
21 *εὐαγγελισάμενοι δὲ τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει*
καὶ μαθητεύσαντες πολλοὺς
ὑπέστρεφον εἰς Λύστραν
καὶ Ἰκόνιον καὶ Ἀντιόχειαν,

19 *διατριβόντων δὲ* (*τε* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *om. D*) *αὐτῶν καὶ διδασκόντων D c.Th. CE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Cass.*: *om. cett.* *ἐπῆλθον D c.Th. CE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Cass.*: *ἐπῆλθον δέ cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) τινες *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *vg.*, *Cass.*: *om. cett.* (*c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπὸ Ἰκον. καὶ Ἀντιοχ. *D c.Th.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Ephr.*: ἀπὸ Ἀντιοχ. καὶ Ἰκον. Ἰουδαῖοι *cett.* (*C*) *καὶ . . . παρρησίᾳ* (+ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$) *c.Th. C c. Athous*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* (*D*), *Cass.* *ἔπεισαν τοὺς ὄχλους c.Th. C c.Ath.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* (*D*), *Cass.* *ἀποστῆναι ἀπ' αὐτῶν c.Th. C c.Ath.*: *μὴ πιστεύειν αὐτοῖς διδάσκουσιν* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Bl.*: *om. cett.* (*D*), *Cass.* *λέγοντες ὅτι . . . ψεύδονται c.Th. C c.Ath*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* (*D*), *Cass.* *καί . . . ὄχλους om. C* *ἐπισείσαντες D c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: [concita]uerunt $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *πείσαντες cett. Cass.* *καὶ λιθάσαντες*] ut lapidarent $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *ἔσυραν* (*-ον* Γ 383 (*m.* 1)) . . . *τεθνάναι αὐτόν*] quem [trahente]s foras extra ciuitatem putaverunt eum esse [mortuum] $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Bl.* *νομίσαντες CE* δ, *Chr.* *τεθνάναι αὐτόν D*: *αὐτ. τεθνηκέναι* (*-νάναι E* δ) Γ *E* δ
20 *κυκλωσάντων* (*-τες D*) *δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτόν* (*αὐτὸν τῶν μαθ. E* 383 (*m.* 2), *vg.*: *αὐτοῦ pro αὐτόν D* 383 (*m.* 1)) *cett.*: τότε ἐκύκλωσαν οἱ *μαθηταὶ αὐτόν* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Bl.*: *καὶ κυκλωθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *καὶ . . . ὄχλου Bl.*: et . . . . ssisset populus $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* (*D*) ἑσπέρας γενομένης (vespere $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$) $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, 𝔈, *Ephr.*: *om. cett.* (*D*) *ἀναστάς*] vix surgens $\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$, *Bl.*

22 ἐπιστηρίζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν μαθητῶν,
παρακαλοῦντές τε ἐμμένειν τῇ πίστει
καὶ ὅτι διὰ πολλῶν θλίψεων
δεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ.
23 χειροτονήσαντες δὲ αὐτοῖς
κατὰ ἐκκλησίαν πρεσβυτέρους,
προσευξάμενοι μετὰ νηστειῶν
παρέθεντο αὐτοὺς τῷ Κυρίῳ
εἰς ὃν πεπιστεύκεισαν.
24 διελθόντες δὲ τὴν Πισιδίαν
ἦλθαν εἰς Παμφυλίαν,
25 καὶ λαλήσαντες ἐν Πέργῃ τὸν λόγον
κατέβησαν εἰς Ἀττάλειαν
εὐαγγελιζόμενοι αὐτούς,
26 κἀκεῖθεν ἀπέπλευσαν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν,
ὅθεν ἦσαν παραδεδομένοι τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ
εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ ἐπλήρωσαν.
27 παραγενόμενοι δὲ
καὶ συνάξαντες τὴν ἐκκλησίαν
ἀνήγγειλαν ὅσα ὁ Θεὸς ἐποίησεν

πόλιν] + Λύστραν (*ante* πόλ. *D*) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ 21 εὐαγγελιζόμενοι *DAE* : bene nuntiavit $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ δέ *DE* : τε Γ δ (+ τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου $\mathfrak{E}^{vt}$)   τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ἐν τῇ πόλει $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην *cett.* (*om.* καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον *v.* 20 . . . τὴν πόλιν ℵ)   πολλούς *D* : ἱκανούς Γ *E* δ   ὑπέστρεφον *D* : ὑπέστρεψαν Γ *E* δ : tunc reversi sunt $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ Λύστραν *D*, *Chr.* : τὴν Λύστραν Γ *E* δ   καί . . . καί *D* δ, *Chr.* : καὶ εἰς . . . καὶ εἰς Γ *E*   22 τε *D* ℵ *corr.* : καί (*ante* παρακ.) *C* δ : *om.* Γ, $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$ (et rogantes eos $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$)   ὅτι] λέγοντες ὅτι *c.Th.*, *vg.*[w], $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Bl.* : [. . . . . .] quia $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ πολλῶν *om.* *Ambst.* ($\frac{3}{3}$), *Ephr.*   δεῖ] oportebit $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ ὑμᾶς $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Ephr.*   εἰσελθεῖν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$), *Orig. alii* : ἐλθεῖν *D*   23 πρεσβ. *ante* κατὰ ἐκκλ. *hab.* *E* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Chr.*   προσευξ.] + δέ *D* : *fort.* τε   εἰς ὃν] + καί δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}$ πεπιστεύκασιν *D* δ, *vg.*   24 διελθ. δέ *D* : καὶ διελθ. Γ *E* δ   Παμφυλίαν] τὴν Παμφ. ℵ *BCE* : Ἀχαΐαν $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ (εἰς Πέργην τῆς Παμφ. καὶ λαλ. ἐκεῖ $\mathfrak{E}$)   25 τὸν λόγον *DB*, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Chr.* : + τοῦ κυρίου (θεοῦ *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) *cett.*   εὐαγγ. αὐτούς (αὐτοῖς 383, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$) *D* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: *om. cett.*   26 ἀπέπλευσαν *om.* *B*[1]   ἦσαν] venerant $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ 27 συνάξαντες *D* : συναγαγόντες Γ *E* δ   ἀνήγγειλαν (-λον *D*) *D* δ : ἀνήγγελλον Γ : ἀπήγγειλαν *E*, *Chr.*   ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν (+ αὐτοῖς *D*) *D* ℵ 614 : ἐποίησ. ὁ θεός *cett.*

μετὰ **τῶν ψυχῶν** *αὐτῶν,*
καὶ ὅτι ἤνοιξεν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν θύραν πίστεως.
28 *διέτριβον δὲ χρόνον*
οὐκ ὀλίγον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς.

XV

1 *καί τινες κατελθόντες*
ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐδίδασκον τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς
ὅτι Ἐὰν μὴ περιτμηθῆτε
καὶ *τῷ ἔθει Μωσέως* **περιπατῆτε,**
οὐ δύνασθε σωθῆναι.
2 *γενομένης δὲ στάσεως*
καὶ ζητήσεως οὐκ ὀλίγης
τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ σὺν αὐτοῖς·
ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος μένειν οὕτως
καθὼς ἐπίστευσαν διϊσχυριζόμενος,
οἱ δὲ ἐληλυθότες ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλὴμ
παρήγγειλαν τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ
καί τισιν ἄλλοις ἀναβαίνειν
πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους
εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ **ὅπως κριθῶσιν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς**
περὶ τοῦ ζητήματος τούτου.

27 μετὰ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν *D*, 𝔏^{g} : μετ' αὐτῶν *cett. Hier.* καὶ ὅτι . . . πίστεως *del. Bl.* (*cf.* xv. 4), *tuentur Ephr. Hier. Cass.* 28 δέ] + ἐκεῖ *E* δ, 𝔖, 𝔈, *Chr.* XV 1 Ἰουδαίας] + τῶν πεπιστευκότων ἀπὸ τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων, *c.Th.* δ, *Bl.* (*cf. v.* 5) περιτέμνησθε *E* δ, *Chr.* καὶ (*om.* Γ) τῷ ἔθει (+ τοῦ Γ) Μωσέως] + καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔθεσιν οἷς διετάξατο *const. Ap.*, *Bl.* περιπατῆτε *D c.Th.*, 𝔈, *Iren.*, *const. Ap.* : *om. cett. Hier.* 2 δέ] οὖν *AE* 614, 𝔏^{d} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}, *Hier.* στάσεως *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : ἐκστάσεως *D* καὶ ζητήσεως *om. E, vg., Hier.* Βαρνάβᾳ *DE* : τῷ Βαρν. Γ δ σὺν αὐτοῖς *D*, 𝔈 : πρὸς αὐτούς *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) ἔλεγεν γὰρ (autem 𝔏^{d}) ὁ Π. μένειν (+ αὐτούς 𝔏^{g}) οὕτως καθὼς ἐπίστευσαν (-εν *c.Th.*) *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{qw}, *Ephr.* : *om. cett. Hier.* διϊσχυριζόμενος *D c.Th.* : *om. cett.* (𝔏^{dg}) οἱ δὲ . . . Ἱερουσαλήμ *D c.Th.*, *Ephr.* : *om. cett. Hier.* παρήγγειλαν (+ αὐτοῖς *D*, + τότε *c.Th.*) τῷ Π. καὶ Β. καί τισιν ἄλλοις ἀναβαίνειν *D c.Th.* : ἔταξαν (+ δέ 𝔏^{g}) ἀναβαίνειν Παῦλον καὶ Β. καί τινας ἄλλους ἐξ αὐτῶν *cett.* καὶ πρεσβυτέρους εἰς Ἱερ. *om. c.Th.* (?) ὅπως κριθῶσιν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς (-τῶν δ) *post* Ἱερ. *hab. D* : *post* τούτου δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *cf. Ephr.* : *om. cett. Hier.* 3 ἐκπεμφθέντες *E* καὶ

3 *οἱ μὲν οὖν προπεμφθέντες*
ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διήρχοντο
τήν τε Φοινίκην καὶ τὴν Σαμάρειαν
ἐκδιηγούμενοι τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν,
καὶ ἐποίουν χαρὰν μεγάλην
πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς·
4 *παραγενόμενοι δὲ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ*
παρεδέχθησαν **μεγάλως** *ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας*
καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων,
ἀνήγγειλάν τε ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν.
5 **οἱ δὲ παραγγείλαντες αὐτοῖς**
ἀναβαίνειν πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους
ἐξανέστησαν λέγοντες
ὅτι δεῖ περιτέμνειν αὐτοὺς
παραγγέλλειν τε τηρεῖν τὸν νόμον Μωσέως.
6 *συνήχθησαν δὲ οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ πρεσβύτεροι*
⟨**σὺν τῷ πλήθει**⟩
ἰδεῖν περὶ τοῦ λόγου τούτου.
7 *πολλῆς δὲ συζητήσεως γενομένης*
ἀνέστη **ἐν Πνεύματι** *Πέτρος*
καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς·
Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε

τήν *D* 383 : καί Γ *E* 614 πᾶσιν *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ 4 παρεδέχθησαν (ἀπεδ. *CE* δ, *Bl.*) *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) : παρεδόθησαν *D* μεγάλως *DC* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Ambr. Cass.* : *om. cett.* ἀνήγγειλάν τε (δέ 614, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: *om.* ℵ, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *cett.* : ἀπηγγείλαντες *D* : adnuntiantes *vg.* ἐποίησεν (+ σὺν αὐτοῖς $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$) ὁ θεός *D* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν *cett.* αὐτῶν] + ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν $\mathfrak{E}$: + καὶ ὅτι ἤνοιξεν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν θύραν πίστεως δ, *Bl.* (*cf.* xiv. 27) 5 οἱ δέ . . . πρεσβυτέρους *D c.Th.* : *om. cett.* ἐξανέστησαν (+ κατὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων *c.Th.*) *D c.Th.* : ἐξαν. δέ *cett.* λέγοντες] λέγοντές τινες ἀπὸ τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων πεπιστευκότες *D* : τινες τῶν ἀπὸ (τινες ὄντες ἀπό *c.Th.*) τῆς αἱρ. τῶν Φαρ. πεπιστευκότες λέγοντες *cett. Cass.* (*cf. v.* 1) τε *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) : δέ *D* 6 καί *D* : καὶ οἱ Γ *E* δ σὺν τῷ πλήθει δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (*D*) λόγου] ζητήματος *E* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ 7 συζητήσεως *DCE* δ, *Chr.* : ζητήσεως Γ (et cum diu haesitarent $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ἄλλων δὲ ἄλλο τι λεγόντων *const. Ap.*) ἀνέστη (-ησεν *D*) *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ἀναστάς *cett.* ἐν πνεύματι (+ ἁγίῳ *c.Th.* 614, *Cass.*) *D c.Th.* 614, *Tert. Cass. Ephr.* : *om. cett.* καὶ εἶπεν *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: εἶπεν *cett.*

ὅτι ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων
ἐν ὑμῖν ὁ Θεὸς ἐξελέξατο διὰ στόματός μου
ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου
8 *καὶ πιστεῦσαι. ὁ δὲ καρδιογνώστης ὁ Θεὸς*
ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς,
δοὺς αὐτοῖς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον
καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖν·
9 *καὶ οὐδὲν διέκρινεν*
μεταξὺ ἡμῶν καὶ αὐτῶν,
τῇ πίστει καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν.
10 *νῦν οὖν τί πειράζετε τὸν Θεόν,*
ἐπιθεῖναι ζυγὸν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τῶν μαθητῶν
ὃν οὔτε οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν
οὔτε ἡμεῖς ἰσχύσαμεν βαστάσαι ;
11 *ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ* **Χριστοῦ**
πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι
καθ' ὃν τρόπον κἀκεῖνοι.
12 **συγκατατιθεμένων δὲ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων**
τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Πέτρου εἰρημένοις
ἐσίγησεν πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος,
καὶ ἤκουον Βαρνάβα καὶ Παύλου
ἐξηγουμένων ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς

7 ἐν ὑμῖν Γ, *Iren.* : ἡμῖν *D* 614 : ἐν ἡμῖν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$), *Amb.* : *om.* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, 𝔈 ὁ θεός (+ ἐν ἡμῖν *E*, *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$) ἐξελ. *cett. Iren. alii* : ἐξελ. ὁ θεός Γ στόματος *DE* : τοῦ στόμ. Γ δ 8 ὁ δέ *D* : καὶ ὁ *cett. Iren. alii* ὁ θεός *D* : θεός Γ *E* δ δοὺς αὐτοῖς *CE* 383, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Iren.*, *reb.* : δοὺς ἐπ' αὐτούς *D* : δούς ℵ *AB* 614 9 ἡμῶν καί *D* : ἡμῶν τε καί Γ *E* δ 10 νῦν οὖν] + ὑμεῖς $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Bl.* : καὶ νῦν (+ ὑμεῖς $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$) *E*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Tert.* πειράζετε] temptastis *Tert.* τὸν θεόν (κύριον *Tert. Hil.*) *om. Ambst. Hier.* $\frac{2}{3}$ ἐπί . . . μαθητῶν] fratribus *Tert. Ambst.* ($\frac{1}{3}$) : gentibus *Aug.* ($\frac{1}{2}$) 11 ἀλλά] ἀλλ' ἤ δ, *const. Ap. Bl.* τοῦ κυρίου (+ ἡμῶν $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Iren.*) Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *DC*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Iren.* : Ἰησοῦ *Tert.* : τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ *cett.* πιστεύομεν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) : πιστεύσομεν *D* ℵ σωθῆναι] nos posse salvari *Iren.* 12 συγκατατιθεμένων . . . εἰρημένοις *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* ἐσίγησεν *D* : ἐσίγ. δέ *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$) ἅπαν *E* Βαρνάβαν καὶ Παῦλον *D* ἐξηγούμενοι *D* δι' αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ 13 ἀναστάς . . . εἶπεν *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ἀπεκρίθη . . . λέγων $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *cett. Tert.* ἀκούσατέ μου *om. Iren.* 14 πρῶτον (-ος 614) *cett.* : *om.* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Iren.* ἐπεσκέψατο *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{e}$) : ἐπελέξατο

σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν δι' αὐτῶν.
13 *μετὰ δὲ τὸ σιγῆσαι αὐτοὺς*
ἀναστὰς Ἰάκωβος εἶπεν·
Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἀκούσατέ μου·
14 *Συμεὼν ἐξηγήσατο καθὼς πρῶτον ὁ Θεὸς*
ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν
15 *τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. καὶ οὕτως συμφωνοῦσιν*
οἱ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν, καθὼς γέγραπται·
16 *Μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπιστρέψω*
καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ
τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν· καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς
ἀνοικοδομήσω, καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν,
17 *ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι*
τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν Θεόν, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,
ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου
ἐπ' αὐτούς, λέγει Κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα.
18 *γνωστὸν ἀπ' αἰῶνός* **ἐστιν τῷ Κυρίῳ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ.**
19 *διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω μὴ παρενοχλεῖν*
τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπιστρέφουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν,
20 *ἀλλ' ἐπιστεῖλαι αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι*
τῶν ἀλισγημάτων τῶν εἰδώλων
καὶ τῆς πορνείας καὶ τοῦ αἵματος,

(ἐξελ. 614) *E* 614, 𝔖 (*cf. Chr.* xxxiii. 2 οὐχ ἁπλῶς ἐξελέξατο) 15 οὕτως *D*, 𝔏g, 𝔈, *Iren.*: τούτῳ *cett. Hier.*, *const. Ap.*, *reb.* συμφωνοῦσιν *cett.* (𝔏d), *Iren.*: συνφωνήσουσιν *D* 16 μετά *cett. Iren.*, *const. Ap. alii*: μετὰ δέ *D* ἐπιστρέψω *D*: ἀναστρέψω Γ *E* δ, *const. Ap.* κατεσκαμμένα (ἀνεσκ. *E*) *DAC* δ, *const. Ap.* (LXX): κατεστραμμένα ℵ *B* 17 ἄν *om. E* (LXX) τὸν θεόν *D*, *reb.*: τὸν κυρίον *cett. Iren.*, *const. Ap.* ὁ (*om.* ὁ ℵ *B*) ποιῶν *cett.* (*D*2), *Iren.*, *const. Ap. alii*: ποιήσει (faciens 𝔏d) *D*1: ὃς ποιήσει *Born.* ταῦτα] πάντα ταῦτα *E*, 𝔖ph (LXX): ταῦτα πάντα 383, 𝔖vg, *Chr.* 18 γνωστόν *D c.Th. A*, *vg.*, *Iren.*: γνωστά *cett.*, *const. Ap.*, *Hier.* ἐστιν *DE* δ, 𝔖, *Iren.*, *const. Ap.*: *om* Γ τῷ κυρίῳ] τῷ θεῷ *E* δ, 𝔏g, 𝔖ph, *Iren.*, *const. Ap.*: *om.* ℵ *BC*, 𝔖vg, *vg.*a τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ *D c.Th. A*, *vg.*, *Iren. Hier.*: πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ *E* δ, 𝔏g, 𝔖ph: τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ 𝔖vg: *om.* ℵ *BC*, 𝔈 19 ἐγώ] + τὸ κατ' ἐμέ *Iren. Arm.*cat *Bl.* 20 ἀλλά] ἀλλ' ἤ *const. Ap.*, *Bl.* (*cf. v.* 11) ἀπέχεσθαι] + ἀπό *ACE* δ ἀλισγημάτων] vanitatibus *Iren.* αἵματος *D*, 𝔏g, *Iren. Amb. Ambst. Gaud. Hier. Ephr.*: + καὶ τοῦ (*om.* τοῦ *AB*) πνικτοῦ (τῶν πνικτῶν *vg.*) *cett.*

καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλουσιν ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι
ἑτέροις μὴ ποιεῖτε·
21 Μωσῆς γὰρ ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων
κατὰ πόλιν ἔχει τοὺς κηρύσσοντας αὐτὸν
ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς
κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκόμενος.
22 τότε ἔδοξεν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις
καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ
ἐκλεξαμένους ἄνδρας ἐξ αὐτῶν πέμψαι
εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν σὺν Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ
Ἰούδαν τὸν καλούμενον Βαρσαββᾶν, καὶ Σιλᾶν,
ἄνδρας ἡγουμένους ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς,
23 γράψαντες **ἐπιστολὴν** διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν
⟨καὶ πέμψαντες⟩
περιέχουσαν τάδε·
Οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἀδελφοὶ
τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν
καὶ Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν
τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἀδελφοῖς χαίρειν·
24 ἐπειδὴ ἠκούσαμεν ὅτι τινὲς ἐξ ἡμῶν
ἐξελθόντες ἐτάραξαν ὑμᾶς λόγοις
ἀνασκευάζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν,
⟨λέγοντες περιτέμνεσθαι καὶ τηρεῖν τὸν νόμον,⟩

20 καὶ ὅσα . . . ποιεῖτε (ποιεῖν *vg.*^{a}, 𝔈, *Iren.*) *D c.Ath.*, 𝔈, *Aristides*, *Iren. Eus. Ephr. alii*: *om. cett.* 21 Μωσῆς . . . αναγιγνωσκόμενος] *versum del. Bl. tamquam ab Irenaeo omissum, cuius lemma fine versus 20 terminatur* ἔχει *post* κατὰ πόλιν *hab. C*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, *post* αὐτόν ℵ *AB* δ, *utroque loco D* 22 ἔδοξεν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : ἐδόξασεν *D* ἐξ αὐτῶν *om. A*, 𝔏^{g}, *Cass.* Παύλῳ *D*, *Chr.* : τῷ Π. Γ *E* δ Βαραββᾶν *D* 23 ἐπιστολήν *hoc loco hab. D*, 𝔖^{vg}, *post* αὐτῶν *c.Th. C* δ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{aw}, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* καὶ πέμψαντες *c.Th.* δ : *om. cett.* (*D*) περιέχουσαν τάδε *D c.Th. C* δ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{aw} : τάδε *E*, *vg.*^{q}, 𝔖, 𝔈, *const. Ap.*, *Chr.* : *om.* ℵ *AB* ἀδελφοί] καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί *E* δ, 𝔖, *const. Ap.* : ἀδελφοῖς 𝔈, *Orig.*^{lat} *Bl.* ἀδελφοῖς *post* ἐθνῶν *hab. D*, *ante* τοῖς ἐξ ἐθν. *cett. Iren.*, *const. Ap.* : *om.* 𝔈, *Orig.*^{lat} *Bl.* 24 ἐξελθόντες (+πρὸς ὑμᾶς *c.Th.*, 𝔈) *cett. Iren.* : *om.* ℵ *B* ἐξετάραξαν *D*^{1} λέγοντες περιτέμνεσθαι (+δεῖ *E*) . . . νόμον *CE* δ, 𝔖 : λέγοντες περιτέμνεσθε καὶ τηρεῖτε τὸν νόμον (*post* διεστειλ.) 𝔏^{g}, *Iren.* : *om. cett.* (*D*) 25 σὺν τοῖς ἀγαπ. ἡμῶν *om.* 𝔈^{vt} ἡμῶν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : ὑμῶν *D* 26 τὴν ψυχήν *D*,

οἷς οὐ διεστειλάμεθα·
25 ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδὸν
ἐκλεξαμένους ἄνδρας πέμψαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς
σὺν τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς ἡμῶν
26 Βαρνάβᾳ καὶ Παύλῳ, ἀνθρώποις
παραδεδωκόσιν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν
ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
εἰς πάντα πειρασμόν.
27 ἀπεστάλκαμεν οὖν Ἰούδαν καὶ Σιλᾶν,
καὶ αὐτοὺς διὰ λόγου ἀπαγγελοῦντας ταῦτα.
28 ἔδοξεν γὰρ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ ἡμῖν
μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιτίθεσθαι ὑμῖν βάρος
πλὴν τούτων τῶν ἐπάναγκες,
29 ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων
καὶ αἵματος καὶ πορνείας,
καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι
ἑτέρῳ μὴ ποιεῖν·
ἀφ᾽ ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς
εὖ πράξετε **φερόμενοι**
ἐν τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι· ἔρρωσθε.
30 οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀπολυθέντες **ἐν ἡμέραις ὀλίγαις**
κατῆλθον εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν,
καὶ συναγαγόντες τὸ πλῆθος

Iren.: τὰς ψυχάς *cett.*, *const. Ap.* εἰς πάντα πειρασμόν *D c.Th. E* δ: *om. cett. Iren.*, *const. Ap.* 27 ἀπαγγελοῦντας *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: ἀπαγγέλλοντας (καταγγ. 614) *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) ταῦτα *D* 614, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: τὰ αὐτά *cett.*, *const. Ap.* (nostram sententiam *Iren.*) 28 τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι *DCE* δ, *Iren. Orig.*: τῷ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ℵ *AB*, *Clem.* πλέον (πλεῖον *D*) *om. Cypr.* ὑμῖν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$): ἡμῖν *D* τούτων (*om. Clem.*) τῶν (*om.* τῶν *D* ℵ) ἐπάναγκες *cett. Clem. Cypr.*: τῶν ἐπάν. τούτων *E* 383, *Chr.* 29 αἵματος *D c.Ath.*, *Iren. Tert. Amb. Ambst. Aug. Ephr. Pac.*: + καὶ πνικτῶν (πνικτοῦ *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*^{a}, *Orig. Cass.*) *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$), *Clem.* $\frac{1}{2}$ καὶ ὅσα . . . ἑτέρῳ (-ροις *vg.*^{q}, *Iren.*) μὴ ποιεῖν (-εῖτε *vg.*^{aq}, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Iren. Cypr.*) *D* 614 *c.Ath.*, *vg.*^{aqw}, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Iren. Cypr.* (*cf. Clem. strom.* ii. 22. 139): *om. cett. Tert. Clem.* $\frac{2}{3}$ *Pac.*, *const. Ap.* ἀφ᾽ ὧν *D*: ἐξ ὧν Γ *E* δ, *Clem.*, *const. Ap.* φερόμενοι . . . πνεύματι *D c.Ath.*, *Iren. Tert. Cass. Ephr.*: *om. cett. Clem. Pac.*, *const. Ap.* 30 ἐν ἡμέραις ὀλίγαις *D*: *om. cett. Cass.* ἦλθον *E* δ, $\mathfrak{S}$ συνάγοντες *D*

ἐπέδωκαν τὴν ἐπιστολήν.
31 ἀναγνόντες δὲ ἐχάρησαν ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλήσει.
32 Ἰούδας δὲ καὶ Σιλᾶς, καὶ αὐτοὶ προφῆται
ὄντες **πλήρεις Πνεύματος Ἁγίου,**
διὰ λόγου *πολλοῦ* παρεκάλεσαν τοὺς ἀδελφούς,
καὶ ἐπεστήριξαν.
33 ποιήσαντες δὲ χρόνον
ἀπελύθησαν μετ᾽ εἰρήνης ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν
πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστείλαντας αὐτούς.
34 **ἔδοξεν δὲ τῷ Σιλᾷ ἐπιμεῖναι αὐτοῦ,**
μόνος δὲ Ἰούδας ἐπορεύθη.
35 ὁ δὲ Παῦλος καὶ Βαρνάβας
διέτριβον ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ
διδάσκοντες καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι,
μετὰ καὶ ἑτέρων πολλῶν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου.
36 μετὰ δέ τινας ἡμέρας
εἶπεν ὁ Παῦλος πρὸς Βαρνάβαν·
Ἐπιστρέψαντες δὴ ἐπισκεψώμεθα τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς
τοὺς κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν, ἐν οἷς κατηγγείλαμεν
τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου, πῶς ἔχουσιν·
⟨**ἤρεσεν δὲ ἡ βουλὴ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ.**⟩
37 Βαρνάβας δὲ ἐβούλετο
συμπαραλαβεῖν Ἰωάννην

30 ἐπιστολήν] + Ἰούδας καὶ Σιλᾶς 𝔖$^{\mathrm{ph}}$ 32 δέ *D*, *vg.*, 𝔖$^{\mathrm{ph}}$: τε *cett.* (𝔏$^{\mathrm{d}}$) ὄντες] ὑπάρχοντες *E* πλήρεις πνεύματος ἁγίου *D* : *om. cett.* πολλοῦ *cett.* : *om. D* καὶ ἐπεστήριξαν (-τήρισαν *CE*) *cett.* : *om.* ℵ 33 τοὺς ἀποστείλαντας αὐτούς] τοὺς ἀποστόλους *E* δ, 𝔖 34 ἔδοξεν . . . αὐτοῦ (-ούς *DC*) *DC* δ, 𝔏$^{\mathrm{g}}$ *vg.*$^{\mathrm{aqw}}$, 𝔖, 𝔈, *Cass. Ephr.* : *om.* ℵ *ABE* μόνος . . . ἐπορεύθη *D*, 𝔏$^{\mathrm{g}}$ *vg.*$^{\mathrm{aqw}}$, *Cass. Ephr.* : *om. cett.* 35 ὁ δὲ Π. *D* : Π. δέ Γ *E* δ μετὰ καί] καὶ μετά *D*^{1} : μετά *D*^{2}, 𝔏$^{\mathrm{g}}$ *vg.* τοῦ κυρίου (θεοῦ 𝔖$^{\mathrm{vg}}$, 𝔈) *cett.* (𝔏$^{\mathrm{d}}$) : τοῦ *D* 36 ὁ (*om.* ὁ *E* δ) Π. πρὸς Βαρν. *DE* δ, 𝔏$^{\mathrm{g}}$, 𝔖, 𝔈 : πρὸς Βαρν. Π. Γ, *vg.* τοὺς κατά *D* δ : κατά Γ *E* κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν *DE* δ : κατὰ πόλιν πᾶσαν Γ ἐν οἷς *D* : ἐν αἷς *cett.* πῶς] τὸ πῶς *E* : καὶ ἴδωμεν πῶς 𝔖, *Bl.* ἤρεσεν . . . Βαρνάβᾳ 𝔖$^{\mathrm{ph}}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (*D*) 37 ἐβούλετο *cett.* (𝔏$^{\mathrm{d}}$) : ἐβουλεύετο *D*, 𝔏$^{\mathrm{g}}$: ἐβουλεύσατο 383, *Chr.* Ἰωάννην *D* 383 : καὶ τὸν (*om.* τόν *ACE*, *Chr.*) Ἰωάννην Γ *E* 614 ἐπικαλ. *DC* δ : καλ. ℵ *AB* 38 οὐκ ἐβούλετο λέγων (+ iis 𝔏$^{\mathrm{d}}$) *D* : ἠξίου *cett.* ἀποστάντα] ἀποστήσαντα *D* συνελθόντα *D* : συν. αὐτοῖς *cett.* εἰς ὃ ἐπέμφθησαν *D*, *vg.*$^{\mathrm{w}}$: *om.*

τὸν ἐπικαλούμενον Μᾶρκον.

38 *Παῦλος δὲ οὐκ ἐβούλετο, λέγων*
τὸν ἀποστάντα ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Παμφυλίας
καὶ μὴ συνελθόντα εἰς τὸ ἔργον
εἰς ὃ ἐπέμφθησαν,
τοῦτον μὴ εἶναι σὺν αὐτοῖς.

39 *ἐγένετο δὲ παροξυσμὸς*
ὥστε ἀποχωρισθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἀπ' ἀλλήλων.
τότε Βαρνάβας παραλαβὼν τὸν Μᾶρκον
ἔπλευσεν εἰς Κύπρον.

40 *Παῦλος δὲ ἐπιλεξάμενος Σιλᾶν*
ἐξῆλθεν παραδοθεὶς τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Κυρίου ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν.

41 *διήρχετο δὲ τὴν Συρίαν καὶ τὴν Κιλικίαν*
ἐπιστηρίζων τὰς ἐκκλησίας
παραδιδούς τε τὰς ἐντολὰς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων.

XVI

1 **Διελθὼν δὲ τὰ ἔθνη ταῦτα**
κατήντησεν εἰς Δέρβην καὶ Λύστραν.
καὶ ἰδοὺ μαθητής τις ἐκεῖ ἦν
ὀνόματι Τιμόθεος,
υἱὸς γυναικὸς Ἰουδαίας πιστῆς,

cett. τοῦτον μὴ εἶναι σὺν αὐτοῖς *D* : μὴ συμπαραλαμβάνειν (-λαβεῖν *E* 383, *Chr.*) τοῦτον *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) 39 ἀποχωρῆσαι *E* 614 τότε (ὁ δέ 𝔏^{d}) Βαρνάβας παραλαβών *D* : καὶ Βαρνάβας μὲν περιλαβών 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈 : τόν τε Βαρνάβαν παραλαβόντα *cett.* ἔπλευσεν (-αν 𝔏^{d}) *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈 : ἐκπλεῦσαι *cett.* 40 Σαῦλος *E*, *Chr.* ἐπιδεξάμενος *D* τοῦ (*om.* τοῦ *D*) κυρίου *D* א *AB*, *vg.*^{q}, 𝔈 : θεοῦ *CE* δ, *vg.*, 𝔖 ἀπό *D* : ὑπό Γ *E* δ 41 καὶ τήν *DB* : καί א *ACE* δ παραδιδοὺς (+autem 𝔏^{d}) τὰς ἐντολὰς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων *D*, *Cass.* : παραδιδοὺς (+τε *c.Th.*) τὰς ἐντ. τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ πρεσβ. *c.Th.*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{aqw}, *cf. Arm.*^{cat} : *om. cett.* XVI 1 διελθὼν (-θόντες *c.Th.*, *Cass.*) δὲ (*om.* δέ 𝔏^{d}) τὰ ἔθνη ταῦτα *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{aqw}, *Cass.* : *om. cett. Hier.* κατήντησεν (-αν *c.Th.*) *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{qw}, *Cass.* : +δέ (δέ καί *AB* : τε *Hier.*) *cett.* καὶ εἰς Δέρβην *AB*, 𝔖^{ph} καὶ Λύστραν *DCE* 383, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} : καὶ εἰς Λ. א *AB* 614 μαθητής τις ἐκεῖ ἦν *D* : ἐκεῖ μαθ. ἦν τις 𝔏^{g} : μαθ. τις ἦν ἐκεῖ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) Ἰουδαίας] viduae 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{w}, *Orig.*^{lat} : *om.* *E*

2 *πατρὸς δὲ Ἕλληνος, ὃς ἐμαρτυρεῖτο*
ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Λύστροις καὶ Ἰκονίῳ ἀδελφῶν·
3 *τοῦτον ἠθέλησεν ὁ Παῦλος σὺν αὐτῷ ἐξελθεῖν,*
καὶ λαβὼν περιέτεμεν αὐτὸν
διὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τοὺς ὄντας
ἐν τοῖς τόποις ἐκείνοις·
ᾔδεισαν γὰρ πάντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ
ὅτι Ἕλλην ὑπῆρχεν.
4 *διερχόμενοι δὲ τὰς πόλεις*
ἐκήρυσσον αὐτοῖς
μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
ἅμα παραδιδόντες
καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων
τῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις.
5 *αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι ἐστερεοῦντο*
τῇ πίστει
καὶ ἐπερίσσευον τῷ ἀριθμῷ καθ' ἡμέραν.
6 *διῆλθον δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν*
καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν,
κωλυθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος
μηδενὶ *λαλῆσαι τὸν λόγον* **τοῦ Θεοῦ** *ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ.*

3 πάντες *DC*: ἅπαντες (*post* αὐτοῦ δ) ℵ *ABE* δ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ὅτι Ἕλλην *DE* δ, 𝔏g, 𝔖, *Chr.*: ὅτι Ἕλλην ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ Γ, *vg.*, 𝔈, *Hier.* 4 διερχόμενοι δέ (οὖν 𝔏g) *D*, 𝔏g, 𝔈 : ὡς δὲ διεπορεύοντο *cett.* ἐκήρυσσον αὐτοῖς *Bl.*: ἐκήρυσσον καὶ παρεδίδοσαν αὐτοῖς *D*, 𝔖vg : κηρύσσοντες *c.Th.* (*voc.* ἐκήρυσσον *firmat Ephr.*) : παρεδίδοσαν (-δίδουν δ) αὐτοῖς *cett. Cass.* μετὰ . . . Χριστόν *D c.Th.*: *om. cett.* ἅμα . . . ἐντολάς *D*: φυλάσσειν τὰ δόγματα τὰ κεκριμμένα (τὰ κεκρ. *post* Ἱερ. *hab.* 𝔏g) ὑπό *cett. Cass.* τῶν (*ante* ἀποστ.) *om. D* τῶν πρεσβ.] *E* 614, *Chr.* Ἱερουσαλήμ *E* δ, *Chr.* 5 τῇ πίστει *om. D* 6 διελθόντες 383, *vg.* Γαλατικὴν (τὴν Γ. *E* δ, *Chr.*) χώραν *cett. Hier.*: Galatiae regiones 𝔏p : τὰς Γαλατικὰς χώρας *Bl.* μηδενί *D*, *Ephr.*: omnino 𝔏g, *spec.*: *om. cett. Hier. Vig.* λαλῆσαι *post* Ἀσίᾳ *hab.* 𝔏g τοῦ θεοῦ *D*, 𝔏g *vg.*a, 𝔖vg, *Ephr.*: *om. cett. Hier. Vig.* 7 γενόμενοι (-νην) *D*: ἐλθόντες Γ *E* δ ἤθελαν *D*, 𝔖vg : ἐπείραζον *cett. Hier.* (ἐπείραζον . . . τὴν Μυσίαν *v.* 8 *om.* 614) εἰς Βιθ. *D*: εἰς τὴν Βιθ. Γ *E* 383 πορεύεσθαι *DC*, *Chr.*: πορευθῆναι Γ *E*: γενέσθαι 383 Ἰησοῦ (κυρίου C¹, 𝔏g) *om.* 383, 𝔈, *Chr.* 8 διελθόντες *D*, 𝔏g *vg.*, 𝔖ph : παρελθόντες Γ *E* δ κατήντησαν *D*: κατέβησαν Γ *E* δ (nos venimus *Iren.*)

7 γενόμενοι δὲ κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν
ἤθελαν εἰς Βιθυνίαν πορεύεσθαι,
καὶ οὐκ εἴασεν αὐτοὺς τὸ Πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ·
8 διελθόντες δὲ τὴν Μυσίαν
κατήντησαν εἰς Τρῳάδα.
9 καὶ ἐν ὁράματι διὰ νυκτὸς ὤφθη τῷ Παύλῳ
ὡσεὶ ἀνὴρ Μακεδών τις
ἑστὼς **κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ**
παρακαλῶν καὶ λέγων·
Διαβὰς εἰς Μακεδονίαν βοήθησον ἡμῖν.
10 **διεγερθεὶς οὖν διηγήσατο** τὸ ὅραμα ἡμῖν,
καὶ ἐνοήσαμεν ὅτι προσκέκληται ἡμᾶς ὁ Κύριος
εὐαγγελίσασθαι τοὺς **ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ.**
11 **τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον** ἀναχθέντες ἀπὸ Τρῳάδος
εὐθυδρομήσαμεν εἰς Σαμοθρᾴκην,
καὶ τῇ ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ εἰς Νεάπολιν,
12 κἀκεῖθεν εἰς Φιλίππους,
ἥτις ἐστὶν **κεφαλὴ** *τῆς
πρώτης μερίδος* τῆς Μακεδονίας,
πόλις κολωνία· ἦμεν δὲ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει
διατρίβοντες ἡμέρας τινάς.

9 ἐν ὁράματι *D*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Iren. Cass.*: ὅραμα *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) *Hier.* νυκτός *DAB*: τῆς νυκτός ℵ *CE* δ ὤφθη (ἐφάνη 614, 𝔏^{g}) τῷ Π. *cett.*: τῷ Π. ὤφθη ℵ *BE*, *Hier.* ὡσεί *D*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Ephr.*: *om. cett. Hier.* τις *DE*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈: τις ἦν *cett. Hier.* κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ *D* δ, 𝔖^{ph}: ante eum 𝔈: *om. cett. Hier.* παρακαλῶν *D*, 𝔏^{g}: καὶ παρακαλῶν αὐτόν *cett. Hier.* 10 διεγερθείς . . . ἡμῖν *D*, 𝔈: ὡς δὲ τὸ ὅραμα εἶδεν *cett. Iren. Hier.* καὶ ἐνοήσαμεν . . . Μακεδονίᾳ *D*: εὐθέως ἐζητήσαμεν ἐξελθεῖν εἰς Μακ. συμβιβάζοντες ὅτι προσκέκληται ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς (κύριος δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈) εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτούς *cett. Iren. Hier.* 11 τῇ δὲ (*om.* δέ 𝔏^{d}) ἐπαύριον ἀναχθέντες (ἀχθ. *D*^{1}) *D c.Th.* δ: ἀναχθέντες οὖν (δέ ℵ *AE*, *vg.*, *Cass.*) *cett. Iren. Hier. Cass.* καὶ τῇ ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ *D*: τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ Γ *E* δ Νεάπολιν *cett.* (*D*): νέαν πόλιν ℵ *AB* 12 κἀκεῖθεν] ἐκεῖθεν δὲ (*om.* δέ 𝔏^{g}) δ, 𝔏^{dg}, 𝔖^{ph} κεφαλή *D*, 𝔖^{vg}: *om. cett.* τῆς πρώτης μερίδος *vg.*$^{q, prov}$: πρώτη μερίς (partis 𝔏^{e}) *E*, 𝔏^{p2}, 𝔈: πρώτη 614, 𝔖^{ph}: πρώτη τῆς (*om.* τῆς *B*) μεριδος Γ *cett. Cass.*: *om. D*, 𝔖^{vg} τῆς *ante* Μακ. *om.* ℵ *AC* ἤμην *D*^{1} διατρίβοντες *ante* ἐν ταύτῃ *hab.* 𝔏^{g}: *om.* 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈

13 *τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων*
ἐξήλθομεν ἔξω τῆς πύλης
παρὰ τὸν ποταμὸν
οὗ ἐδόκει προσευχὴ εἶναι,
καὶ καθίσαντες ἐλαλοῦμεν
ταῖς συνεληλυθυίαις γυναιξίν.
14 *καί τις γυνὴ ὀνόματι Λυδία,*
πορφυρόπωλις τῆς πόλεως Θυατείρων
σεβομένη τὸν Θεόν, ἤκουσεν,
ἧς ὁ Κύριος διήνοιξεν τὴν καρδίαν,
προσέχειν τοῖς λαλουμένοις ὑπὸ Παύλου.
15 *ὡς δὲ ἐβαπτίσθη, καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκος αὐτῆς,*
παρεκάλεσεν λέγουσα·
Εἰ κεκρίκατέ με πιστὴν τῷ Θεῷ εἶναι,
εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου μένετε·
καὶ παρεβιάσατο ἡμᾶς.
16 *ἐγένετο δὲ πορευομένων ἡμῶν*
εἰς προσευχὴν παιδίσκην τινὰ
ἔχουσαν πνεῦμα πύθωνα
ἀπαντῆσαι ἡμῖν,
ἥτις ἐργασίαν πολλὴν παρεῖχεν τοῖς κυρίοις
διὰ τούτου *μαντευομένη.*
17 *αὕτη κατακολουθοῦσα τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ ἡμῖν*

13 δέ *D* δ, *Chr.* : τε Γ *E* πύλης] πόλεως *E* δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* : πύλης πόλεως 𝔖^{vg} τόν *D* : *om.* Γ *E* δ ἐδόκει *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖 : ἐνόμιζεν ℵ : ἐνομίζομεν (-ζετο *E* δ, *Chr.*) *cett.* προσευχήν ℵ A^2 *C* συνεληλυθυίαις *D* : συνελθούσαις Γ *E* δ (+ἡμῖν ℵ *CE*, 𝔈 : +ἐκεῖ 𝔖) 14 τῆς *D* : *om.* Γ *E* δ (Θυατ. *ante* πόλ. *hab.* 𝔏^{d}, 𝔖^{ph}) θεόν] +ἥτις *E* ἤκουσεν *D* δ, *Chr.* : ἤκουεν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : +τὸν λόγον 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*^{w} Παύλου *DB* : τοῦ Π. ℵ *ACE* δ 15 καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκος *D*, 𝔏^{w} : αὐτὴ καὶ ὁ οἶκος *E*, 𝔖, 𝔈 : καὶ ὁ οἶκος Γ δ, *vg.* : cum omnibus suis 𝔏^{g} θεῷ *D* : κυρίῳ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) μείνατε *C* δ, *Chr.* 16 προσευχήν *D* δ, *Chr.* : τὴν προσ. Γ *E*, *Orig.* πύθωνος *E* δ 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈, *Luc. Cass.* ἀπαντῆσαι *DA* δ, *Chr.* : ὑπαντῆσαι ℵ *BCE*, *Orig.* κυρίοις *D* : +αὐτῆς *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) διὰ τούτου *D* : *om. cett. Orig. Luc.* 17 κατακολουθοῦσα *D* ℵ *B* : -θήσασα *ACE* δ, *Orig.* καὶ ἔκραζεν (-ον) *D* : ἔκραξεν *Orig.* οἱ δοῦλοι *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.* : οἱ ἄνθρωποι δοῦλοι *cett. Orig.* εὐαγγελίζονται (*ex* -τες *D*) *D*, 𝔖^{vg} : καταγγέλλουσιν *cett. Orig.* ὑμῖν *cett.* (*E*) *Luc.* : ἡμῖν *AC* δ, 𝔏^{e}, 𝔈, *Orig.* 18 ἐπιστρέψας δὲ ὁ Π. τῷ πνεύματι καὶ

ἔκραζεν λέγουσα·
Οὗτοι οἱ δοῦλοι τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου εἰσίν,
οἵτινες εὐαγγελίζονται ὑμῖν ὁδὸν σωτηρίας.
τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίει ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἡμέρας.
18 *ἐπιστρέψας δὲ ὁ Παῦλος τῷ πνεύματι*
καὶ διαπονηθεὶς εἶπεν·
Παραγγέλλω σοι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
ἵνα ἐξέλθῃς ἀπ' αὐτῆς· καὶ εὐθέως ἐξῆλθεν.
19 *ὡς δὲ εἶδαν οἱ κύριοι τῆς παιδίσκης*
ὅτι ἀπεστέρηνται τῆς ἐργασίας αὐτῶν
ἧς εἶχαν δι' αὐτῆς,
ἐπιλαβόμενοι τὸν Παῦλον καὶ Σιλᾶν
εἵλκυσαν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας,
20 *καὶ προσαγαγόντες αὐτοὺς τοῖς στρατηγοῖς*
εἶπαν· Οὗτοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι
ἐκταράσσουσιν ἡμῶν τὴν πόλιν
Ἰουδαῖοι ὑπάρχοντες,
21 *καὶ καταγγέλλουσιν ἔθη*
ἃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἡμῖν παραδέξασθαι οὔτε ποιεῖν
Ῥωμαίοις ὑπάρχουσιν.
22 *καὶ πολὺς ὄχλος συνεπέστησαν*
κατ' αὐτῶν **κράζοντες.**
τότε οἱ στρατηγοὶ περιρρήξαντες αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια

διαπονηθείς *D*, *Amb.*: διαπον. δὲ Π. καὶ (*om.* καί $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.*) ἐπιστ. τῷ πνεύματι *cett. Luc.* ἐν τῷ *D* 383: ἐν Γ *E* 614 ἵνα ἐξέλθῃς *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Luc.*: ἐξελθεῖν (εὐθέως ἐξ. *Amb.*) Γ *E* δ, *Amb.* εὐθέως ἐξῆλθεν *D*: ἐξῆλθεν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ (eadem hora exiit $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$) *cett. Amb. Luc.* 19 ὡς δὲ εἶδαν *D*: καὶ ἰδόντες *B*: ἰδόντες δέ *cett. Luc.* τῆς παιδίσκης *D*: αὐτῆς *cett. Luc. Cass.* ἀπεστέρησθαι *D*, *corr. Bl.*: ἐξῆλθεν (+ ἐξ αὐτῆς $\mathfrak{S}$) ἡ ἐλπίς *cett. Luc.* ἧς εἶχαν δι' αὐτῆς *D*, *Cass.*: *om. cett. Luc.* καί *DC*: καὶ τόν א *ABE* δ εἵλκυσαν] ἔσυραν *E* ἄρχοντας] magistratus $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *Luc.*: στρατηγούς *Bl.* 20 προσαγαγόντες . . . εἶπαν] obtulerunt . . . dicentes $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc. Bl.* τοῖς στρατηγοῖς *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc. Bl.* 21 ἔθη] τὰ ἔθνη *D* ἡμῖν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$): ἡμᾶς *D* παραδέξασθαι *D*: παραδέχεσθαι Γ *E* δ οὔτε *D*: οὐδέ Γ *E* δ ὑπάρχουσιν *D*: οὖσιν Γ *E* δ 22 πολὺς ὄχλος συνεπέστησαν *D*: συνεπέστη ὁ ὄχλος (ὅλος ὁ ὄχλ. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc*: ὄχλος πολύς $\mathfrak{S}$) *cett. Luc.* κράζοντες *D*: *om. cett. Luc.* τότε *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: καί *cett. Luc.*

ἐκέλευον ῥαβδίζειν.
23 πολλάς τε ἐπιθέντες αὐτοῖς πληγὰς
ἔβαλον εἰς φυλακὴν
παραγγείλαντες τῷ δεσμοφύλακι
ἀσφαλῶς τηρεῖσθαι αὐτούς·
24 ὁ δὲ παραγγελίαν τοιαύτην λαβὼν
ἔβαλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν ἐσωτέραν φυλακήν,
καὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν ἠσφαλίσατο ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ.
25 κατὰ δὲ μέσον τῆς νυκτὸς
ὁ Παῦλος καὶ Σιλᾶς προσευχόμενοι
ὕμνουν τὸν Θεόν,
ἐπηκροῶντο δὲ αὐτῶν οἱ δέσμιοι·
26 ἄφνω δὲ σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας
ὥστε σαλευθῆναι τὰ θεμέλια τοῦ δεσμωτηρίου,
ἠνεῴχθησαν δὲ παραχρῆμα αἱ θύραι πᾶσαι,
καὶ πάντων τὰ δεσμὰ ἀνελύθη.
27 καὶ ἔξυπνος γενόμενος ὁ δεσμοφύλαξ
καὶ ἰδὼν ἀνεῳγμένας τὰς θύρας τῆς φυλακῆς
σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν
ἔμελλεν ἑαυτὸν ἀναιρεῖν,
νομίζων ἐκπεφευγέναι τοὺς δεσμίους.
28 ἐφώνησεν δὲ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Παῦλος λέγων·

22 ῥαβδίζειν] + αὐτούς $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Luc.* 23 τηρεῖσθαι *D*: τηρεῖν *cett. Luc.* 24 ὁ δέ *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: ὅς *cett. Luc.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, εἰς τὴν ἐσωτέραν φυλακήν] in imam carceris $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, *Luc.* ἠσφαλίσατο αὐτῶν Γ ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ (*post* αὐτῶν $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.*) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.*: εἰς τὸ ξύλον *cett.* 25 μέσον τῆς νυκτός *D*: τὸ (*om.* ℵ) μεσονύκτιον Γ *E* δ, *Orig.* ὁ Π. *D*: Π. Γ *E* δ ἐπηκρ. δέ] καὶ (*om. Luc.*) ἐπηκρ. 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}$, *Luc.* οἱ (καὶ οἱ *C*, *Orig.*) δέσμιοι *cett. Cypr.*: ceteri vincti $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.* 26 θεμέλια *cett.* (*Luc.*): πάντα τὰ θεμέλια $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ παραχρῆμα *om. B*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.* ἀνελύθη *D* ℵ: ἀνέθη *ABCE* δ 27 καὶ ἔξυπνος γεν. *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ἔξυπνος δὲ γεν. *cett.* (experge autem ſactus $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$, *Luc.*) δεσμοφύλαξ] + ὁ πιστὸς Στεφανᾶς 614 ἀνεῳγμ. *post* θύρας *hab. C*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *post* φυλακ. *Luc.* σπασάμενος *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$): καὶ σπασ. *D* τήν *DBC*: *om.* ℵ *AE* δ ἔμελλεν *D* δ, *Chr.*: ἤμελλεν Γ *E* 28 φωνῇ μεγάλῃ (*post* Παῦλ. *hab. B*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Luc.*) *cett.* (*D*): μεγάλῃ φωνῇ *AB*, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ ὁ *DAE* δ: *om.* ℵ *BC* πράξῃς] ποιήσῃς *E* κακόν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$): τι κακόν *D* 614 29 φῶτα δὲ αἰτ. *D*: αἰτ. δὲ φῶτα *cett.*: ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ δεσμοφύλαξ αἰτήσας (+ τε *vg.*[w], *Bl.*) φῶτα $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*[w],

Μηδὲν πράξῃς σεαυτῷ κακόν,
ἅπαντες γάρ ἐσμεν ἐνθάδε.
29 φῶτα δὲ αἰτήσας εἰσεπήδησεν,
καὶ ἔντρομος ὑπάρχων
προσέπεσεν **πρὸς τοὺς πόδας** τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Σιλᾷ,
30 καὶ προήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἔξω
τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀσφαλισάμενος,
καὶ εἶπεν **αὐτοῖς·**
Κύριοι, τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν ἵνα σωθῶ ;
31 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· Πίστευσον ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν **Χριστόν,**
καὶ σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ ὁ οἶκός σου.
32 καὶ ἐλάλησαν αὐτῷ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου
σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ.
33 καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς
ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τῆς νυκτὸς
ἔλουσεν ἀπὸ τῶν πληγῶν,
καὶ αὐτὸς ἐβαπτίσθη
καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ πάντες παραχρῆμα,
34 ἀναγαγών τε αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ
παρέθηκεν τράπεζαν,
καὶ ἠγαλλιᾶτο σὺν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ
πεπιστευκὼς ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν.

Luc. Bl. ὑπάρχων *DC* 614, *Chr.*: γενόμενος ℵ *AB* 383, 𝔏^{d}: *om.* 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, 𝔈, *Luc.* πρὸς τοὺς πόδας *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *vg.*^{q} 𝔖, *Cass. Luc.*: *om. cett.* Σίλᾳ *DBC*: τῷ Σ. ℵ *AE* δ 30 προήγαγεν *D*: προαγαγών (προάγων ℵ, προσαγαγών *C* 614) *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀσφ. (+προσῆλθεν 𝔖^{ph}) *D*, 𝔖^{ph}: *om. cett.* καὶ *D*, 𝔖: *om. cett.* εἶπεν *D*: ἔφη Γ *E* δ αὐτοῖς *D*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈: *om. cett.* 31 ἐπί] εἰς *E* Χριστόν *DCE* δ, 𝔖, 𝔈: *om. cett. Luc.* πᾶς ὁ οἰκός *E* 32 τοῦ (*om.* τοῦ *D*) κυρίου *cett.*: τοῦ θεοῦ ℵ *B* σύν] καί *E* δ, 𝔖, *Chr.* 33 ἐκείνῃ] ipsa (= αὐτῇ τῇ) 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.* ἔλυσεν *D* αὐτὸς ἐβαπτ. *D*: ἐβαπτ. αὐτός *cett.* πάντες *DACE*: ἅπαντες ℵ *B* δ (cum omnibus suis 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.*) παραχρῆμα *om.* 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.* 34 αὐτοῦ *om.* *BC* 614, 𝔏^{g}, *Luc. Bl.* παρέθηκεν] +αὐτοῖς *E*, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} ἠγαλλιᾶτο *D* 383 (*m.* 2): ἠγαλλιάσατο Γ *E* δ (383, *m.* 1) σὺν τῷ οἰκῷ αὐτοῦ *D*: πανοικί *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): *om.* *E* ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν *D*: τῷ θεῷ (κυρίῳ *E*, 𝔏^{dg}, 𝔈, *Luc.*) *cett.*

35 ἡμέρας δὲ γενομένης **συνῆλθον οἱ στρατηγοὶ**
ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν
καὶ ἀναμνησθέντες
τὸν σεισμὸν τὸν γεγονότα ἐφοβήθησαν
καὶ ἀπέστειλαν τοὺς ῥαβδούχους λέγοντες·
Ἀπόλυσον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκείνους
οὓς ἐχθὲς παρέλαβες.
36 καὶ **εἰσελθὼν** ὁ δεσμοφύλαξ
ἀπήγγειλεν τοὺς λόγους πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον,
ὅτι Ἀπεστάλκασιν οἱ στρατηγοὶ
ἵνα ἀπολυθῆτε· νῦν οὖν
ἐξελθόντες πορεύεσθε
ἐν εἰρήνῃ.
37 ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἔφη πρὸς αὐτούς·
Δείραντες ἡμᾶς δημοσίᾳ
ἀναιτίους ἀνθρώπους
Ῥωμαίους ὑπάρχοντας, ἔβαλαν εἰς φυλακήν·
καὶ νῦν λάθρᾳ ἡμᾶς ἐκβάλλουσιν;
οὐ γάρ, ἀλλὰ ἐλθόντες αὐτοὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξαγαγέτωσαν.
38 ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ οἱ ῥαβδοῦχοι
τὰ ῥηθέντα πρὸς τοὺς στρατηγούς·
οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ὅτι Ῥωμαῖοί εἰσιν

35 συνῆλθον . . . ἐφοβήθησαν *D c.Th., Cass. Ephr.* : *om. cett.* καὶ ἀπέστειλαν *D c.Th.* : ἀπέστ. οἱ στρατηγοί *cett.* λέγοντας *D* οὓς ἐχθὲς παρέλαβες *D* δ, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett.* (*voc.* ἐχθές *tuetur Ephr.*) 36 καὶ εἰσελθὼν ὁ δεσμ. ἀπήγγειλεν *D* : καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ δεσμ. εἰσελθὼν ἀπήγγ. 𝔖^{vg} : ἀπήγγ. δὲ (τε *E* 383, οὖν 𝔏^{g}) ὁ δεσμ. *cett.* τοὺς λόγους *DBC* : + τούτους *cett.* ἀπεστάλκασιν *DE* δ : ἀπέσταλκαν Γ ἐν εἰρήνῃ *om. D*, 𝔏^{g} 37 πρὸς αὐτούς *ante* ἔφη *hab.* 𝔏^{g}, *om. E* ἀναιτίους (anetios 𝔏^{d}) *ante* δείραντες *hab. D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *post* Ῥωμαίους 𝔈, *Cass.* : *post* δημοσίᾳ *posui* ἀνθρώπους 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Cass.* : ἀκατακρίτους ἀνθρώπους *cett.* (*D*) αὐτοὶ ἡμᾶς ἐλθόντες *E* 38 ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ 383, *Bl.* : + τοῖς στρατηγοῖς (αυτοισοι στρατ., *duabus lect., ut videtur*, αὐτοῖς *et* τοῖς στρατ. *conflatis D*[1]) *cett.* (τοῖς στρατ. *post* οἱ ῥαβδ. *hab. E*) ῥαβδοῦχοι] + τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα *codd.* (*D*, 𝔖^{vg}), *del. Bl.* τὰ ῥηθέντα πρὸς τοὺς στρατηγούς *D* : τὰ ῥηθέντα αὐτοῖς 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.* οἱ δέ . . . ἐφοβήθησαν *D*, 𝔖^{vg} : ἐφοβ. δὲ (καὶ ἐφοβ. *E* δ, 𝔈, *Chr.*) ἀκούσ. ὅτι Ῥωμαῖοί εἰσιν *cett. Cass.* 39 παραγενόμενοι *D* : ἐλθόντες Γ *E* δ μετὰ φίλων . . . φυλακήν *D* : εἰς τὴν φυλακήν δ. 𝔖^{ph} : πρὸς αὐτούς 𝔖^{vg}, *Cass.* : *om. cett.* ἐξελθεῖν εἰπόντες *D* δ, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett.* ἠγνοήσαμεν . . . δίκαιοι

39 ἐφοβήθησαν, καὶ παραγενόμενοι
μετὰ φίλων πολλῶν εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν
παρεκάλεσαν αὐτοὺς ἐξελθεῖν εἰπόντες·
Ἠγνοήσαμεν τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς
ὅτι ἐστὲ ἄνδρες δίκαιοι.
ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης ἐξέλθατε
μήποτε πάλιν συστραφῶσιν ἡμῖν
οἱ ἐπικράζοντες καθ' ὑμῶν.
40 ἐξελθόντες δὲ ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς
ἦλθον πρὸς τὴν Λυδίαν,
καὶ ἰδόντες τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς
διηγήσαντο ὅσα ἐποίησεν Κύριος αὐτοῖς
παρακαλέσαντες αὐτούς, καὶ ἐξῆλθαν.

XVII

1 Διοδεύσαντες δὲ τὴν Ἀμφίπολιν
κατῆλθον εἰς Ἀπολλωνίαν
κἀκεῖθεν εἰς Θεσσαλονίκην,
ὅπου ἦν συναγωγὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.
2 καὶ κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς
ὁ Παῦλος εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς αὐτούς,
καὶ ἐπὶ σάββατα τρία διελέχθη αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν,

D δ, 𝔖ph, *Ephr.*: *om. cett.*, *qui post* παρεκάλεσαν αὐτούς *habent* καὶ ἐξαγαγόντες ἠρώτων ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως. ἐξελθόντες δέ (*v.* 40). δίκαιοι] + καὶ ἐξαγαγόντες παρεκάλεσαν αὐτοὺς λέγοντες *D*, *Bl.* ἐκ (καὶ ἐκ δ) . . . ἐξέλθατε *D* δ, 𝔖ph, *Ephr.*: ἀπελθεῖν (ἐξ- *E*, *Chr.*) ἀπὸ (ἐκ *E*) τῆς πόλεως *cett.* μήποτε (μήπως δ) πάλιν συστραφῶσιν (ἐπιστραφῶσιν πάλιν δ) ἡμῖν (*om.* ἡμῖν 𝔖ph) οἱ (*om.* οἱ *D*) ἐπικράζοντες (-κράξαντες δ) καθ' ὑμῶν *D* δ, 𝔖ph, *Ephr.*: *om. cett.* καθ' ὑμῶν] + καὶ ἐξαγαγόντες ἠρώτων ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως 𝔖ph 40 ἐκ] ἀπό ℵ *B* ἦλθον *D*, 𝔏g: εἰσῆλθον *cett.* τοὺς ἀδελφούς *cett. Cass.*: *om.* Γ διηγήσαντο . . . αὐτοῖς *D*, *vg.*a, *Cass.*: *om. cett.* παρακαλέσαντες (+ τε 𝔏g, *Bl.*) *D*: παρεκάλεσαν *cett.* (𝔏d) αὐτούς *cett.*: τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς Γ καί *om.* 𝔏g, *del. Bl.* XVII 1 διελθόντες δέ *E* τὴν Ἀμφίπ. (+ καί *D*) κατῆλθον εἰς Ἀπολλωνίαν (*ex* -ιδα) κἀκεῖθεν *D*: τὴν Ἀπολλ. καὶ τὴν Ἀμφίπ. ἦλθον *E*: τὴν Ἀμφίπ. (τὴν πόλιν ℵ) καὶ τὴν (*om.* τὴν δ) Ἀπολλ. ἦλθον *cett.* ἡ συναγωγή *E* δ 2 καὶ κατά *D*: κατὰ δέ (itaque 𝔏g) *cett.* ὁ Παῦλος *D*, 𝔏g *vg.*, 𝔖vg: τῷ Παύλῳ *cett.* καί *om.* *D* διελέχθη *DE* δ: διελέξατο Γ ἐκ *D*: ἀπό Γ *E* δ

3 διανοίγων καὶ παρατιθέμενος,
ὅτι τὸν Χριστὸν ἔδει παθεῖν
καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν,
καὶ ὅτι Οὗτός ἐστιν Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς
ὃν ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν.
4 καί τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπείσθησαν **τῇ διδαχῇ**,
καὶ προσεκληρώθησαν
τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Σιλᾷ
πολλοὶ τῶν σεβομένων
καὶ Ἑλλήνων πλῆθος πολὺ
καὶ γυναῖκες τῶν πρώτων οὐκ ὀλίγαι.
5 οἱ δὲ ἀπειθοῦντες Ἰουδαῖοι
συστρέψαντές τινας ἄνδρας
τῶν ἀγοραίων πονηροὺς
καὶ ὀχλοποιήσαντες
ἐθορύβησαν τὴν πόλιν,
καὶ ἐπιστάντες τῇ οἰκίᾳ Ἰάσονος
ἐζήτουν αὐτοὺς ἐξαγαγεῖν εἰς τὸν δῆμον.
6 μὴ εὑρόντες δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔσυραν Ἰάσονα
καί τινας ἀδελφούς ἐπὶ τοὺς πολιτάρχας,
βοῶντες **καὶ λέγοντες**
ὅτι Οἱ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀναστατώσαντες
οὗτοί **εἰσιν** καὶ ἐνθάδε πάρεισιν,

3 τόν *om.* *D*^{1} Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς *DA* : Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ℵ 614 : ὁ Χρ. ὁ Ἰησ. *B* 383 : Ἰησ. ὁ Χρ. *E* 4 ἐπίστευσαν *E* δ : *om.* 𝔖^{ph} τῇ διδαχῇ *post* Σιλᾷ *hab.* *D*, *post* ἐπείσθ. *posuit* *Bl.* : *om. cett.* πολλοὶ τῶν σεβομένων καὶ Ἑλλήνων *D* : τῶν τε σεβ. (+ καί *A*) Ἑλλήνων *cett.* καὶ γυναῖκες *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖 : γυναικῶν τε *cett.* τῶν πρώτων *om.* 𝔏^{g} 5 οἱ δὲ ἀπειθοῦντες (*om.* ἀπειθ. 𝔏^{g}) . . . τῶν ἀγοραίων *D*, 𝔏^{g} : ζηλώσαντες δὲ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ προσλαβόμενοι (+ οἱ ἀπειθοῦντες δ : + τοὺς ἀπειθοῦντας 𝔖^{ph}) τῶν ἀγορ. ἄνδρας τινάς (τινὰς ἄνδρας ℵ δ) *cett.* καὶ ὀχλοποιήσαντες] ἀπειθήσαντες καὶ ὀχλοπ. *E* : *om.* *D* ἐθορύβησαν (-ουσαν) *D* : ἐθορύβουν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) (ἐθορ. τὴν πόλιν *om.* 𝔈^{vt}) Ἰάσονος ℵ *B* 614 : Ἰασῶνος *DAE* 383 (*ita mox*) ἐξαγαγεῖν *D*, 𝔈 : προαγαγεῖν (προσ- *E* 614) *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : ut educerent . . . et traderent 𝔖^{vg} 6 τινας] + ἄλλους *E*, 𝔈 καὶ λέγοντες *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *vg.*^{aw} : *om. cett.* εἰσιν *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{aw}, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.* 7 λέγοντες ἕτερον εἶναι *D* 383 : λεγ. εἶναι ἕτερον *E* : ἕτερον λεγ. εἶναι *cett.* Ἰησοῦν] nescio quem Iesum 𝔏^{g} : τίνα ποτὲ Ἰησοῦν *Bl.* 8 καὶ ἐτάραξαν *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈 : ἐτάρ. δέ

7 οὓς ὑποδέδεκται Ἰάσων· καὶ οὗτοι πάντες
ἀπέναντι τῶν δογμάτων
Καίσαρος πράσσουσιν,
βασιλέα λέγοντες ἕτερον εἶναι Ἰησοῦν.
8 καὶ ἐτάραξαν τοὺς πολιτάρχας
καὶ τὸν ὄχλον ἀκούοντας ταῦτα·
9 ⟨**οἱ μὲν οὖν πολιτάρχαι**⟩
λαβόντες τὸ ἱκανὸν παρὰ τοῦ Ἰάσονος
καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς.
10 οἱ δὲ ἀδελφοὶ εὐθέως διὰ νυκτὸς
ἐξέπεμψαν τὸν Παῦλον καὶ τὸν Σιλᾶν εἰς Βέροιαν,
οἵτινες παραγενόμενοι
εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀπῄεσαν.
11 οὗτοι δὲ ἦσαν εὐγενέστεροι τῶν ἐν τῇ Θεσσαλονίκῃ,
οἵτινες ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον
μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας,
καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνακρίνοντες τὰς γραφὰς
εἰ ἔχει ταῦτα οὕτως
⟨**καθὼς Παῦλος ἀπαγγέλλει**⟩.
12 τινὲς μὲν οὖν αὐτῶν ἐπίστευσαν,
τινὲς δὲ ἠπίστησαν·
καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τῶν εὐσχημόνων
ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες

cett. τοὺς πολιτάρχας καὶ τὸν ὄχλον *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}: τὸν ὄχλον (τὴν πόλιν *E*) καὶ τοὺς πολιτ. *cett.* ἀκούοντας (-τες 614) *cett.*: ἀκούσαντας (-τες) *D*: λέγοντες *c.Th.* 9 οἱ μὲν οὖν πολιτάρχαι *c.Th.*, *cf. Ephr.*: *om. cett.* (*D*) λαβόντες *c.Th.*: καὶ λαβόντες *cett.* (*D*) τὸ ἱκανόν] sponsores *c.Th.*, 𝔖^{vg} παρὰ τοῦ Ἰασ. καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν *om. c.Th.*, *ut vid.* 10 τὸν Παῦλον *D*: τόν τε Π. Γ *E* δ ἀπῄεσαν] εἰσῄεσαν *E* 11 ἦσαν] εἰσιν 𝔏^{dg} εὐγενέστεροι *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): εὐγενεῖς *D* ἐν τῇ *D*: ἐν Γ *E* δ λόγον] + τοῦ θεοῦ *E*: + τοῦ κυρίου 𝔈 πάσης *cett.* (𝔏^{e}): *om. E* ἔχει *DE*: ἔχοι *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) καθὼς Π. ἀπαγγέλλει δ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Prisc. Ephr.*: *om. cett.* (*D*) 12 τινές . . . αὐτῶν *D*: πολλοί . . . ἐξ αὐτῶν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) τινές δὲ ἠπίστησαν *D* δ: *om. cett.* καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων (+ καί *D*, *del. Bl.*) τῶν εὐσχημόνων ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες *D*: καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἄνδρες πολλοὶ καὶ γυναῖκες εὐσχήμονες 𝔖^{vg}: καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνίδων γυναικῶν τῶν εὐσχημόνων (+ ἐπίστευσαν 383) καὶ ἀνδρῶν (ἄνδρες *vg.*) *cett.*

ἱκανοὶ **ἐπίστευσαν.**
13 ὡς δὲ ἔγνωσαν οἱ ἀπὸ Θεσσαλονίκης
Ἰουδαῖοι ὅτι λόγος Θεοῦ κατηγγέλη
εἰς Βέροιαν **καὶ ἐπίστευσαν,**
ἦλθον **εἰς αὐτὴν,** κἀκεῖ σαλεύοντες
καὶ ταράσσοντες τοὺς ὄχλους **οὐ διελίμπανον.**
14 τὸν μὲν οὖν Παῦλον
οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἐξαπέστειλαν
ἀπελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν·
ὑπέμεινεν δὲ ὁ Σιλᾶς καὶ ὁ Τιμόθεος ἐκεῖ·
15 οἱ δὲ καθιστῶντες τὸν Παῦλον
ἤγαγον ἕως Ἀθηνῶν,
παρῆλθεν δὲ τὴν Θεσσαλίαν·
ἐκωλύθη γὰρ εἰς αὐτοὺς
κηρῦξαι τὸν λόγον.
λαβόντες δὲ ἐντολὴν **παρὰ Παύλου**
πρὸς τὸν Σιλᾶν καὶ Τιμόθεον
ὅπως ἐν τάχει ἔλθωσιν
πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐξῄεσαν.
16 ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἀθήναις ἐκδεχομένου αὐτοὺς τοῦ Παύλου
παρωξύνετο τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ

12 ἱκανοί *D*: οὐκ ὀλίγοι *cett.* ἐπίστευσαν *D*: *om. cett.* 13 Θεσσ. *DE* 614: τῆς Θεσσ. Γ 383 λόγος θεοῦ κατηγγέλη (+ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου 𝔖^{vg}) εἰς Βέροιαν *D*, 𝔖^{vg}: καὶ ἐν τῇ Βεροίᾳ κατ. ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου (*om.* ὑπὸ τοῦ Π *Cass.*) ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ *cett. Cass.* καὶ ἐπίστευσαν *D*: *om. cett. Cass.* ἦλθον] καὶ ἦλθον *D* εἰς αὐτήν *D*: *om. cett.* καὶ ταράσσοντες *om. E*, *Chr.* (ταράσσ. *ante* σαλεύ. *habet* 𝔈) οὐ διελίμπανον *D*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Cass.*: *om. cett.* 14 τὸν μὲν οὖν Παῦλον *D*: καὶ τὸν Π. 𝔖^{vg}: εὐθέως δὲ (τε 𝔏^{d}) τότε (*om.* τότε δ, 𝔏^{d}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈) τὸν Π. *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἐξαπ. *D*: ἐξαπ. οἱ ἀδελφοί *cett.* ἀπελθεῖν *D*: πορεύεσθαι Γ *E* δ ἐπὶ *D*, 𝔏^{g}: ἕως (ὡς δ, *Chr.*) ἐπὶ *cett.* (ad mare versus 𝔏^{d}) ὑπέμεινεν *DA* 383, 𝔈: ὑπέμειναν (ὑπέμενον 614, ἀπέμειναν *E*) *cett.* 15 οἱ δέ *D* 614, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*: οἵ τε Γ *E* 383 καθιστῶντες] καταστάνοντες *D* (*cf.* i. 6) ἤγαγον] +αὐτόν *E*, *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph} παρῆλθεν . . . λόγον *D*, *Ephr.*: *om. cett.* λαβ. δέ *D*: καὶ λαβ. *cett.*: et cum exirent ab eo acceperunt (*om.* ἐξῄεσαν *infra*) 𝔖^{vg} ἐντολήν] ἐπιστολήν *E*, 𝔖^{vg} παρὰ Παύλου *D*: ἀπ' αὐτοῦ *E*, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈: *om. cett.* καί *DA* δ: καὶ τόν ℵ *BE* ὅπως *D*: ἵνα Γ *E* δ ἐν τάχει *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈: ὡς τάχιστα *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) 16 αὐτούς] αὐτοῦ *D* ℵ, 𝔖^{vg} τὸ πνεῦμα] πνεῦμα

θεωροῦντι κατείδωλον οὖσαν τὴν πόλιν.
17 διελέγετο μὲν οὖν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις
καὶ τοῖς σεβομένοις
καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ κατὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν
πρὸς τοὺς παρατυχόντας.
18 τινὲς δὲ καὶ τῶν Ἐπικουρείων
καὶ τῶν Στοϊκων φιλοσόφων
συνέβαλλον αὐτῷ, καί τινες ἔλεγον·
Τί ἂν θέλοι ὁ σπερμολόγος οὗτος λέγειν;
οἱ δέ· Ξένων δαιμονίων
δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι·
ὅτι τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν εὐηγγελίζετο.
19 **μετὰ δὲ ἡμέρας τινὰς** ἐπιλαβόμενοι αὐτοῦ
ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἄρειον πάγον
πυνθανόμενοι καὶ λέγοντες·
Δυνάμεθα γνῶναι τίς ἡ καινὴ αὕτη ἡ ὑπὸ σοῦ
καταγγελλομένη διδαχή;
20 ξενίζοντα γάρ τινα φέρεις ῥήματα
εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς ἡμῶν· βουλόμεθα οὖν γνῶναι
τί ἂν θέλοι ταῦτα εἶναι.
21 Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πάντες

D[1] θεωροῦντι *D* 383 : θεωροῦντος Γ *E* 614 17 τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις] τῶν Ἰουδαίων 𝔏[g] (Iudaeis *ante* ἐν τῇ συν. *hab. Aug.* ⅔) καὶ τοῖς] *add.* ἔθνεσιν καὶ τοῖς *Aug.* τοῖς ἐν *D c.Th.* δ, 𝔈 : ἐν *cett. Aug.* παρατυχόντας *D*: παρατυγχάνοντας Γ *E* δ 18 δὲ καί] δέ *E* δ, 𝔏[g] *vg.*, 𝔖[ph], *Amb.* καὶ τῶν] καί ℵ *B* Στωϊκῶν *B* συνέβαλλον *cett.* (𝔏[d]) : συνέλαβον *D*[1] καί τινες] τινες δέ 𝔏[g] *vg.*[w] θέλῃ *D*[1] οἱ δέ] + ἔλεγον 𝔏[g] *vg.*[qw], 𝔖[vg] ὅτι . . . εὐηγγελίζετο (+ αὐτοῖς *AE* δ, *vg.*, 𝔖[vg]) *cett.*: *om. D*, 𝔏[g], *Aug. Bl.* 19 μετὰ δὲ (*om.* δέ 𝔏[d]) ἡμέρας τινάς *D* δ, 𝔖[ph] : *om. cett. Aug.* ἐπιλαβόμενοι *D* δ, 𝔖[ph] : ἐπιλαβόμενοί τε (δέ *B*) *cett.* (𝔏[d]) *Aug.* ἤγαγον αὐτὸν (*om.* αὐτόν 𝔏[d]) ἐπὶ τὸν (*om.* τόν *D*) Ἄρειον πάγον *D*, 𝔏[g] *vg.*[q], 𝔖[ph], 𝔈 : ἐπὶ τὸν Ἄρειον πάγον ἤγαγον (ἦγον *A*) *cett. Aug.* πυνθανόμενοι καί *D* : *om. cett. Aug.* (*cf. Chr.* 286 e ἐν ἐλπίδι τοῦ μαθεῖν . . . ἐγκαλοῦσιν) αὕτη ἡ] αὕτη *D* ὑπὸ σοῦ καταγγελλομένη *D* : ὑπὸ σοῦ λαλουμένη (λεγομένη *E*) *cett.* : *om.* 𝔏[g] (quae sint haec quae a te dicuntur *Aug.*) 20 φέρεις ῥήματα (ῥήματα εἰσφέρεις *E*) *DE*, 𝔖[vg], 𝔈 : εἰσφέρεις *cett.* (𝔏[d]) *Aug.* τί ἂν θέλοι *DE* 383, *Aug. Chr.* : τίνα θέλει Γ : τίνι ταῦτα θέλοι 614 21 πάντες *om. Aug.* ½

καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες **εἰς αὐτοὺς** *ξένοι*
εἰς οὐδὲν ἕτερον ηὐκαίρουν
ἢ λέγειν τι ἢ ἀκούειν καινότερον.
22 *σταθεὶς δὲ* **ὁ Παῦλος** *ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Ἀρείου πάγου ἔφη·*
Ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, κατὰ πάντα
ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ·
23 *διερχόμενος γὰρ καὶ διϊστορῶν*
τὰ σεβάσματα ὑμῶν εὗρον καὶ βωμὸν
ἐν ᾧ ἦν γεγραμμένον· Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ.
ὃ οὖν ἀγνοοῦντες εὐσεβεῖτε,
τοῦτο ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν.
24 *ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον*
καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ,
οὗτος οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς κύριος ὑπάρχων
οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ,
25 *οὐδὲ ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρωπίνων θεραπεύεται*
προσδεόμενός τινος,
ὅτι οὗτος ὁ δοὺς πᾶσιν ζωὴν καὶ πνοὴν
26 *καὶ τὰ πάντα· ἐποίησέν τε ἐξ ἑνὸς* **αἵματος**
πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων

21 εἰς αὐτούς *D*: ἐκεῖ 𝔖: *om. cett.* (𝔏^{d}) *Aug.* τι ἤ] τι καί *E* 383, 𝔖^{vg} ἀκούειν *DE* δ, *Aug.*: ἀκούειν τι Γ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖 22 ὁ Π. *DE* δ, *Chr.*: *om.* Γ ἔφη] εἶπεν ℵ *E* 23 διερχόμενος] περιερχόμενος 𝔏^{d}, 𝔖, *Clem.* ($\frac{1}{2}$) διϊστορῶν *D*: ἱστορῶν *Clem.* ($\frac{1}{2}$): ἀναθεωρῶν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Clem.* ($\frac{1}{2}$) *Hier.* (considerans *Aug.*) ἦν γεγραμμένον *D*: ἐπεγέγραπτο (ἐν- *Orig.*, ἀν- *Clem.* $\frac{1}{2}$) *cett. Clem. Orig.* ἀγνώστοις θεοῖς *Tert.* ($\frac{2}{2}$) *Hier.* (*ad Tit.* i. 12), *cf. Paus.* I. 1–4, *Philostr.* vi. 3: *singularem tuentur Clem. Orig. Aug. Hier. Cass.* ὅν . . . τοῦτον *E* δ, 𝔖, 𝔈, *Clem. Aug.* $\frac{3}{3}$ *Hier.* $\frac{1}{2}$ 24 οὗτος . . . ὑπάρχων *om. Hier. Is.* xviii. 798 κύριος ὑπάρχων *D* 383, *Iren. Clem.* $\frac{1}{2}$: ὑπάρχων κύριος *cett.* (*om.* κύρ. 614, ὑπάρχ. *post* οὗτος *hab.* 𝔏^{g}, *spec.*, *cf.* 𝔏^{d}) 25 ὡς προσδεόμενος ℵ, 𝔏^{deg}, *Iren.* τινος *om. D* ὅτι οὗτος (αὐτός 𝔏^{d}) ὁ δοὺς πᾶσιν *D*: αὐτὸς διδοὺς (δούς *Clem.* $\frac{1}{2}$) πᾶσιν *cett. Clem. Aug.* (cum ipse omnibus dederit *Iren.*) καὶ τά] καί ℵ *E*: κατά δ (*om.* καὶ τὰ πάντα 𝔖^{vg}) 26 τε *om. DE*, 𝔖^{ph} αἵματος *DE* δ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖, *Iren. Aug. Ephr.*: *om.* Γ, *vg.*, 𝔈, *Clem.* ἔθνος] γένος *c. Th.* δ, 𝔏^{e} *vg.*, *Iren. Clem. Aug.* ἀνθρώπων *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): ἀνθρώπου *D* ἐπὶ πᾶν πρόσωπον *E* δ (ἐπὶ πρόσωπον πάσης τῆς γῆς 𝔖, *Iren.*) προστεταγμένους *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): προτετ. *D*: *om. Iren. Ambst.* κατὰ ὁροθεσίαν *D*, *Iren.*: καὶ τὰς ὁροθεσίας *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Clem.* 27 μάλιστα *D*: *om. cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Iren. Clem.* ὃ (τό *D*) θεῖον

κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ παντὸς προσώπου τῆς γῆς,
ὁρίσας προστεταγμένους καιροὺς
κατὰ ὁροθεσίαν τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν,
27 *μάλιστα* *ζητεῖν ὃ θεῖόν ἐστιν,*
εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτὸ
ἢ εὕροιεν, καίγε οὐ μακρὰν
ὃν ἀφ' ἑνὸς ἑκάστου ἡμῶν·
28 *ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα*
καὶ ἐσμὲν **τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν.**
ὥσπερ καὶ τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς τινὲς εἰρήκασιν·
Τούτου γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν.
29 *γένος οὖν ὑπάρχοντες τοῦ Θεοῦ*
οὐκ ὀφείλομεν νομίζειν
οὔτε *χρυσῷ ἢ ἀργύρῳ*
ἢ λίθῳ, χαράγματι τέχνης
ἢ ἐνθυμήσεως ἀνθρώπου,
τὸ θεῖον εἶναι ὅμοιον.
30 *τοὺς μὲν οὖν χρόνους τῆς ἀγνοίας* **ταύτης**
παριδὼν ὁ Θεὸς τὰ νῦν παραγγέλλει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις
πάντας πανταχοῦ μετανοεῖν,

ἐστιν *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *Iren.*: τὸ θεῖον *Clem. Amb.*: τὸν θεόν (κύριον *E*) *cett.* ψηλαφήσαισαν *D*, *Bl.* αὐτὸ ἤ (*om.* ἤ 𝔏^{d}) *DA*, 𝔏^{g}, *Iren. Amb.*: αὐτὸν καί (ἤ *vg.*, 𝔈) *cett.*: ἤ *Clem.* εὕροισαν *D*, *Bl.* (+τίς εἴη *c.Th.*) καίγε (τε *D*) *DB* δ: καίτοι *AE*, *Clem.*: καίτοιγε ℵ ὃν (*om.* 𝔏^{d}) ἀφ' ἑνὸς ἑκάστου ἡμῶν *D*, *vg.*, *Iren. Aug.*: ἀπὸ (ἀφ' *E*) ἑνὸς ἑκάστου ἡμῶν ὑπάρχοντα (-τος *E*, *Clem.*) *cett. Clem.* 28 αὐτῷ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): αὐτῇ *D* καὶ ἐσμὲν καὶ κινούμεθα *Amb.* $\frac{5}{6}$ τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν *D*: *om. cett. Iren. Clem. Aug.* ὥσπερ *D*: ὡς Γ *E* δ τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς τινές *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *Iren. Amb. Ambst. Aug.* $\frac{3}{3}$ *Pac.*: τινες τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς (ἡμᾶς *B* 614) ποιητῶν (σοφῶν 𝔖^{vg}) *cett. Orig. Clem. Hier.* $\frac{3}{3}$ τούτου *D* 383: αὐτοῦ *E*, *vg.*, *Hier.* $\frac{3}{3}$: τοῦ Γ 614, *Clem. Orig.* 29 οὔτε *D*: *om. cett. Iren.*, *spec.* παραχάραγματι *Bl.* (lapidi per artem vel concupiscentiam hominis deformato *Iren.*) ἤ *D*, *Iren. Did.*: καί *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) ἐνθυμήσεως] ἐπιθυμίας 𝔏^{dg}, *Iren.*, *spec.* ἀνθρώπων *E* τὸ θεῖον εἶναι ὅμοιον *ante* χρυσῷ *hab.* 𝔈, *Iren.* 30 καὶ τοὺς χρόνους μὲν οὖν *E*, *vg.* ταύτης *D*, *vg.*: *om. cett. Iren.* παριδών *D*: ὑπεριδών Γ *E* δ (*utramque lectionem agnoscit Chr.*) παραγγέλλει *DAE* δ, 𝔈: ἀπαγγέλλει ℵ *B* πάντας Γ *E*, *Aug.*, *spec.*: πᾶσιν δ, *Iren.*: ἵνα πάντες *D* μετανοεῖν] +εἰς αὐτόν *Iren. Bl.*

31 *καθότι ἔστησεν ἡμέραν κρῖναι τὴν οἰκουμένην*
ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἐν ἀνδρὶ Ἰησοῦ
ᾧ ὥρισεν πίστιν παρασχεῖν
πᾶσιν ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.
32 *ἀκούσαντες δὲ ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν*
οἱ μὲν ἐχλεύαζον,
οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· Ἀκουσόμεθά σου
33 *περὶ τούτου πάλιν. οὕτως ὁ* Παῦλος
ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν·
34 *τινὲς δὲ ἄνδρες κολληθέντες*
αὐτῷ ἐπίστευσαν,
ἐν οἷς καὶ Διονύσιός *τις* Ἀρεοπαγίτης
**καὶ γυνὴ ὀνόματι* Δάμαρις*
εὐσχήμων *καὶ ἕτεροι σὺν αὐτοῖς.*

XVIII

1 Ἀναχωρήσας *δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν* Ἀθηνῶν
ἦλθεν εἰς Κόρινθον.
2 *καὶ εὑρών τινα* Ἰουδαῖον
ὀνόματι Ἀκύλαν, Ποντικὸν *τῷ γένει,*

31 ἔστησεν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) : ἔστησαν *D* κρῖναι *D*, *Iren. Aug.*, *spec.* : ἐν ᾗ μέλλει κρίνειν (quo iudicet $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) *cett.* ἐν ἀνδρί *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) : ἀνδρί *D* Ἰησοῦ *D*, *vg.*[a], *Iren.* : *om. cett. Amb. Aug.* παρασχεῖν πᾶσιν (πᾶσιν παρασ. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: παρασχὼν πᾶσιν Γ *E* δ, 𝔖, 𝔈 : πᾶσιν *Amb. Ambst. Aug.* $\frac{4}{4}$: *om. Iren.* 32 πάλιν (καὶ πάλιν Γ) *post* σου *hab.* δ, *om.* 𝔈 33 καὶ οὕτως δ, 𝔖, 𝔈 34 ἄνδρες . . . αὐτῷ *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ κολληθέντες *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) : ἐκολλήθησαν *D* (*fort.* καί *ante* ἐπίστ. *supplendum*) αὐτῷ] Παύλῳ $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ οἷς καί] οἷς $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ τις *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: ὁ (*om. B*) *cett.* καὶ . . . Δάμαρις (-αλις $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$) *cett.* : *om. D* εὐσχήμων *D*, *Aug.* (*serm.* 150. 2) : τιμία (*post* γυνή) *E* : *om. cett.* ἕτεροι] . . . teri $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: multi ceteri *Berg.* XVIII 1 ἀναχωρήσας δὲ (+ ὁ Παῦλος $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$) ἀπό *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: μετὰ (+ δέ *E* 383, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Chr.*) ταῦτα χωρισθεὶς (+ ὁ Παῦλος *AE* δ, *vg.*[qw], $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$) ἐκ *cett.* 2 καὶ εὑρών . . . γένει] et invenit Aquilam natione Pon[ticum Iu]daeum $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ σὺν Πρισκίλλῃ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, 𝔈 : καὶ Πρίσκιλλαν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ *cett.* (*D*) ἠσπάσατο αὐτούς $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *hoc loco*, *post* προσῆλθεν αὐτοῖς (*infra*) $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*[aw] : *om. cett.* (*D*) οὗτοι δέ . . . Ῥώμης *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* (*D*), *Aug.* διατεταχέναι *AB* : διατεταχθῆναι 614 Κλαύδιος *D* : *om. B* : + Καίσαρα $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ καὶ (οἳ καί *D*) . . . Ἀχαΐαν *D c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Ado* : *om. cett.* 3 ὁ

προσφάτως ἐληλυθότα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας
σὺν Πρισκίλλῃ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ
⟨ἠσπάσατο αὐτούς.
οὗτοι δὲ ἐξῆεσαν ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης⟩
διὰ τὸ τεταχέναι Κλαύδιον
χωρίζεσθαι πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης,
καὶ κατῴκησαν εἰς τὴν Ἀχαΐαν.
3 **⟨ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἐγνώσθη τῷ Ἀκύλᾳ⟩,**
καὶ διὰ τὸ ὁμότεχνον
ἔμενεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ ἠργάζετο,
ἦσαν γὰρ σκηνοποιοὶ τῇ τέχνῃ.
4 **εἰσπορευόμενος** δὲ εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν
κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον διελέγετο,
ἐντιθεὶς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ,
ἔπειθέν τε **οὐ μόνον** Ἰουδαίους
ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἕλληνας.
5 ὡς δὲ παρεγένοντο ἀπὸ τῆς Μακεδονίας
ὅ τε Σιλᾶς καὶ ὁ Τιμόθεος, συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ
ὁ Παῦλος διαμαρτυρόμενος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις
εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν **Κύριον** Ἰησοῦν.

δὲ Παῦλος . . . Ἀκύλᾳ *c.Th.*, 𝕷^{h}, *spec.*: προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ (ad eos 𝕷^{d}) ὁ Παῦλος *D*: προσῆλθεν αὐτοῖς *cett. Aug.* (+καὶ ἠσπάσατο αὐτούς 𝕷^{g} *vg.*^{aw}) ὁμότεχνον *D*, *Aug.*: ὁμότεχνον (ὁμόφυλον καὶ ὁμότ. *c.Th.*, *spec.*) εἶναι *cett.* ἔμεινεν *E* 383, *Chr.*: *om. c.Th.* πρὸς αὐτούς *D*: apud eum 𝕷^{h}: παρ' αὐτοῖς *cett.* καὶ ἠργάζετο (+ σὺν αὐτοῖς 𝕾) *cett. Ambst. Aug.*, *spec.*: καὶ ἠργάζοντο ℵ *B*: *om.* 𝕷^{h} ἦσαν . . . τέχνῃ (+αὐτῶν 𝕾) *cett. Orig. Aug.*, *spec.*: *om. D*, 𝕷^{g} 4 εἰσπορευόμενος δὲ εἰς τὴν συν. κατὰ πᾶν σάββ. διελέγετο *D*, 𝕷^{h} *vg.*^{a}: διελέγετο δὲ ἐν τῇ συν. κατὰ πᾶν σάββ. *cett.* ἐντιθείς (καὶ ἐντ. *D*) . . . Ἰησοῦ *D c.Th.*, 𝕷^{gh}, *vg.*^{aqw}: *om. cett.* ἔπειθέν τε (δέ 𝕷^{h}) *cett.*: καὶ ἔπειθεν δέ (*om.* δέ 𝕷^{d}) *D* οὐ μόνον Ἰουδαίους ἀλλά *D*, 𝕷^{h}, *vg.*^{a}: Ἰουδαίους *cett.* 5 ὡς δὲ παρεγένοντο] παρεγένοντο δέ *D*: tunc superuenerunt 𝕷^{h}: ὡς δὲ κατῆλθον Γ *E* δ ὅ τε] τότε *D* καὶ ὁ] καί *D* συνείχετο (συνεῖχέ τε *Hilg.*) . . . Ἰησοῦν *om.* 𝕷^{h} (constrictus erat in sermone ipse Paulus eo quod insurgerent in eum Iudaei et blasphemarent (*ex v.* 6), cum testaretur eis quod Iesus esset Christus 𝕾^{vg}) λόγῳ] πνεύματι *c.Th.* 383 ὁ *om. D* διαμαρτυρούμενος *D* εἶναι *om. E* 383, *Chr.* Χριστὸν κύριον Ἰησ. *D*: κύριον Ἰησ. Χριστόν 383: Χριστὸν Ἰησ. Γ *E*, *vg.*: Ἰησ. Χριστόν 614, 𝕷^{g}, 𝕾

6 **πολλοῦ δὲ λόγου γινομένου**
καὶ γραφῶν διερμηνευομένων,
ἀντιτασσομένων δὲ αὐτῶν
καὶ βλασφημούντων
ἐκτιναξάμενος **ὁ Παῦλος** τὰ ἱμάτια **αὐτοῦ**
εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς·
Τὸ αἷμα ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑμῶν·
καθαρὸς ἐγώ· ἀφ' ὑμῶν
νῦν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πορεύομαι.
7 καὶ μεταβὰς **ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀκύλα**
εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκόν τινος
ὀνόματι Ἰούστου, σεβομένου τὸν Θεόν,
οὗ ἡ οἰκία ἦν συνομοροῦσα τῇ συναγωγῇ.
8 ὁ δὲ ἀρχισυνάγωγος Κρῖσπος
ἐπίστευσεν εἰς τὸν Κύριον
σὺν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν Κορινθίων
ἀκούοντες ⟨**τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου**⟩
ἐβαπτίζοντο **πιστεύοντες τῷ θεῷ**
διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
9 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Κύριος δι' ὁράματος τῷ Παύλῳ ἐν νυκτί·

6 πολλοῦ δέ (atque iterum cum multis fieret verbum etc. 𝔏^{h}) . . . διερμηνευομένων *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{h} : *om. cett.* ἐκτιναξάμενος] tunc exc[ussit] 𝔏^{h} ὁ Παῦλος *D*, 𝔏^{h} *vg.*^{w} : *om. cett.* αὐτοῦ *D*, 𝔏^{gh} *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.* εἶπεν αὐτοῖς (ad illos 𝔏^{e}) *E* τὸ αἷμα . . . ὑμῶν *om.* 𝔖^{vg} (Christi Domini sanguis effusus vos oneret *Cass.*) ἀφ' ὑμῶν νῦν . . . πορεύομαι *D* : νῦν πορεύομαι . . . ἀφ' ὑμῶν 𝔏^{h} : ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν . . . πορεύσομαι (-εύομαι 𝔖^{vg}) *cett.* 7 καί *om.* *D*^{1} ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀκύλα *D*, 𝔏^{h} : ἐκεῖθεν (+ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀκύλα 614) *cett.* ἦλθεν *BE* δ, 𝔖^{ph} τὸν οἶκον *Bl.* : τον ι||||ν *D* : οἰκίαν Γ *E* δ τινος ὀνόματι *om.* 𝔏^{h} Ἰούστου *DA* δ, 𝔏^{h} : Τίτου 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Cass.* : Τίτου (Τιτίου *B*, 𝔖^{ph}) Ἰούστου *cett.* οὗ . . . ἦν] erat autem domus eius 𝔏^{h} 8 ὁ δὲ ἀρχ. Κρῖσπος *D* : arch. autem quida[m nomine] Crispus 𝔏^{h} : Κρῖσπος δὲ ὁ ἀρχ. *cett.* εἰς τὸν κύριον *D*, 𝔏^{h} : τῷ κυρίῳ *cett.* πολλοί] . . . a plebs 𝔏^{h} (πολὺς ὄχλος *Bl.*) ἀκούσαντες δ, 𝔏^{h} τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου 𝔏^{h} : *om. cett.* (*D*) ἐβαπτίζοντο] . . . t 𝔏^{h} (tinti sunt *Buch.*) : ἐπίστευον καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο *D* Γ : ἐπίστευσαν δ, 𝔖^{ph} πιστεύοντες τῷ θεῷ *D*, 𝔏^{h} : *om. cett.* διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (*om.* ἡμῶν δ, 𝔖^{ph}) Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *D* δ, 𝔖^{ph} (*post* ἐπίστευσαν δ, 𝔖^{ph}) : in nomine Iesu Christi 𝔏^{h} : *om. cett.*

Μὴ φοβοῦ, ἀλλὰ λάλει καὶ μὴ σιωπήσῃς·
10 διότι ἐγώ εἰμι μετὰ σοῦ
καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιθήσεταί σοι τοῦ κακῶσαί σε·
διότι λαός ἐστί μοι πολὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ.
11 καὶ ἐκάθισεν **ἐν Κορίνθῳ**
ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ μῆνας ἓξ
διδάσκων αὐτοὺς τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ.
12 Γαλλίωνος δὲ ἀνθυπάτου ὄντος τῆς Ἀχαΐας
κατεπέστησαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν
οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι **συλλαλήσαντες**
μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἐπὶ τὸν Παῦλον,
καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας
ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα,
13 **καταβοῶντες καὶ** λέγοντες
ὅτι Παρὰ τὸν νόμον οὗτος ἀναπείθει
τοὺς ἀνθρώπους σέβεσθαι τὸν Θεόν.
14 μέλλοντος δὲ τοῦ Παύλου ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα
εἶπεν ὁ Γαλλίων πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους·
Εἰ μὲν ἦν ἀδίκημά τι
ἢ ῥᾳδιούργημα πονηρόν,
ὦ **ἄνδρες** Ἰουδαῖοι, κατὰ λόγον ἂν

Χριστοῦ] + καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο δ, 𝔖^{ph} 9 τότε εἶπεν 𝔏^{h} ὁ *om.* *D* δι' ὁράματος τῷ Π. ἐν νυκτί *D*, 𝔏^{g} : δι' ὁράμ. ἐν νυκτὶ τῷ Π. *E* δ, 𝔖^{ph} : ἐν νυκτὶ δι' ὁράμ. τῷ Π. ℵ *B* : τῷ Π. ἐν ὁράματι 𝔏^{h} : ἐν ὁράμ. τῷ Π. *A*, 𝔖^{vg} μὴ σιωπήσῃς] ui[de ne tac]eas 𝔏^{h} 10 διότι . . . κακῶσαί σε *om.* *Ambst.* σοι *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : *om.* *DE*, 𝔏^{gh} 11 καὶ ἐκάθ. *D*, 𝔏^{h} : ἐκάθ. δέ (τε *E*, *Chr.*) *cett.* ἐν Κορίνθῳ *D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖 : ἐκεῖ 𝔏^{g}, *vg.*, 𝔈 : *om.* *cett.* αὐτούς *D*, 𝔖^{vg} : ἐν (*om.* 383) αὐτοῖς *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) 12 δέ] τε *D*, 𝔖^{vg} ἀνθυπατεύοντος *E* δ, *Chr.* οἱ Ἰουδ. ὁμοθυμαδόν *B* συλλαλήσαντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν *D*, 𝔏^{h} : *om.* *cett.* ἐπὶ τὸν Παῦλον *D* : de Paulo 𝔏^{h} (*ita* 𝔏^{d}) : τῷ Παύλῳ *cett.* καὶ ἐπιθέντες (inie[cerunt ei] manus 𝔏^{h}) τὰς χεῖρας (+ αὐτῷ 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈) *D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈, *cf.* *Arm.*^{cat} : *om.* *cett.* ἤγαγον αὐτόν *D*, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* : καὶ ἤγαγον αὐτόν (*om.* αὐτόν 𝔏^{gh}) *cett.* ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα] εἰς τὸν ἀνθύπατον 𝔏^{h}, *Arm.*^{cat} : εἰς τὸν ἀνθύπατον ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα 𝔖^{ph} 13 καταβοῶντες καί *D*, 𝔏^{h} : *om.* *cett.* οὗτος *post* ἀναπείθει *hab.* Γ : *om.* 𝔏^{h} τὸν θεόν σέβεσθαι 𝔏^{h} 14 δέ] τε 𝔏^{h} : οὖν 𝔏^{g} ἀδίκημά τι] + ἐν αὐτῷ 𝔏^{h} πονηρόν *om.* 𝔏^{g} ἄνδρες *D*, 𝔏^{h} *vg.* : *om.* *cett.*

ἠνεσχόμην ὑμῶν·
15 εἰ δὲ ζήτημα ἔχετε περὶ λόγου καὶ ὀνομάτων
καὶ νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς, ὄψεσθε αὐτοί·
κριτὴς ἐγὼ τούτων οὐ θέλω εἶναι.
16 καὶ ἀπήλασεν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος.
17 ἐπιλαβόμενοι δὲ πάντες **οἱ Ἕλληνες**
Σωσθένην τὸν ἀρχισυνάγωγον
ἔτυπτον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος·
τότε ὁ Γαλλίων προσεποιεῖτο μὴ ἰδεῖν.
18 ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἔτι προσμείνας ἡμέρας ἱκανὰς
τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἀποταξάμενος
ἔπλευσεν εἰς τὴν Συρίαν
καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ Πρίσκιλλα καὶ Ἀκύλας,
κειράμενος τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς,
εἶχε γὰρ εὐχήν.
19 καταντήσας δὲ εἰς Ἔφεσον
τῷ ἐπιόντι σαββάτῳ
εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν
διελέγετο τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις.

14 ἠνεσχόμην *post* ὑμῶν *hab.* 𝔏^{gh} *vg.* 15 ζήτημα *D*, 𝔏^{e}, *Chr.* : ζητήματα *cett.* (*E*) ἔχετε *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *Ephr.* : ἐστιν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : aliquae sunt inter vos 𝔏^{h} περί . . . νόμου] vel de verbo [vel de no]minibus vel de lege 𝔏^{h} αὐτοὶ ὄψεσθε 𝔏^{h} κριτής] + γάρ *E* δ, 𝔖, 𝔈 ἐγὼ τούτων *cett.* (*D*) : τούτων ἐγώ 𝔏^{dg}, 𝔖^{ph} : τούτων 𝔏^{h} θέλω *D* : βούλομαι Γ *E* δ 16 ἀπήλασεν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : ἀπέλυσεν *D*, 𝔏^{h} (dimisit) βήματος] + αὐτοῦ 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg} 17 ἐπιλαβόμενοι (adprehendentes eum 𝔏^{d}) *cett.* : ἀπολαβόμενοι *D* πάντες *om.* 𝔏^{h} οἱ Ἕλληνες *cett.* *Aug.* *Ephr.* : *om.* Γ, *vg.* Σωσθένην] || || Σωσθ. *D* (cum Sosth. 𝔏^{d}) : τότε Σωσθ. *Hilg.* ἔτυπτον] + αὐτόν 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖 τότε (καί 𝔏^{h}) ὁ Γαλλίων προσεποιεῖτο μὴ ἰδεῖν 𝔏^{dh} (*D legi non potest*) : legatus factus est (= προσεποιεῖτο) quasi non vidisset *Ephr.* : καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων τῷ Γαλλίωνι ἔμελεν (-ελλεν ℵ *E* 383) *cett.* 18 ἔτι] ἔφη ἔτι ℵ : *om.* 𝔏^{gh}, 𝔖^{vg} προσμείνας (ἐπιμ. *E*) *cett.* : + ἐκεῖ 𝔏^{gh}, 𝔖^{vg} ἀπετάξατο τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς 𝔏^{gh}, 𝔖 ἔπλευσεν *D* : πλέων 𝔏^{h} : ἐξέπλει Γ *E* δ κειράμενος τὴν κεφ. ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς *DE* δ, 𝔖 : κειράμενος ἐν Κεγχ. τὴν κεφ. Γ, 𝔖^{vg}, *Hier.* : qui (= *Aquila*) votum cum fecisset [Cenchris] caput tondit 𝔏^{h} (κειράμενοι *et mox* εἶχον *hab.* *vg.*) εὐχήν] προσευχήν *D* 19 καταντήσας *D*, 𝔏^{h} : κατήντησεν δ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph} : κατήντησαν *cett.* τῷ ἐπιόντι σαββάτῳ (in se[quenti] *ante defectum* 𝔏^{h}) 𝔏^{h}, 𝔈 : καὶ (*om.* 𝔖^{ph}) τῷ ἐπιόντι σαββάτῳ ἐκείνους (κἀκείνους 𝔖^{ph}) κατέλιπεν ἐκεῖ *D*, 𝔖^{ph} : κἀκείνους κατέλιπεν ἐκεῖ (αὐτοῦ *B* δ) *cett.* : *om.* 𝔖^{vg} εἰσελθών 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : αὐτὸς δὲ

20 *ἐρωτώντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ πλείονα χρόνον*
μεῖναι **παρ' αὐτοῖς** *οὐκ ἐπένευσεν,*
21 *ἀλλὰ ἀπετάξατο αὐτοῖς εἰπών·*
Δεῖ με πάντως τὴν ἑορτὴν ἐρχομένην
ποιῆσαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα· *ἀνακάμψω πρὸς ὑμᾶς*
†*τοῦ* Θεοῦ *θέλοντος·*
22 ⟨**τὸν δὲ Ἀκύλαν εἴασεν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ·**
αὐτὸς δὲ ἀναχθεὶς⟩ *ἦλθεν εἰς* Καισάρειαν.
καὶ ἀναβὰς καὶ ἀσπασάμενος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν,
κατέβη εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν,
23 *καὶ ποιήσας χρόνον τινὰ*
ἐξῆλθεν, διερχόμενος καθεξῆς
τὴν Γαλατικὴν *χώραν καὶ* Φρυγίαν,
καὶ ἐπιστηρίζων πάντας τοὺς μαθητάς.
24 Ἰουδαῖος *δέ τις ὀνόματι* Ἀπολλώνιος,
γένει Ἀλεξανδρεύς, *ἀνὴρ λόγιος,*
κατήντησεν εἰς Ἔφεσον,
δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς,
25 *ὃς ἦν κατηχημένος* **ἐν τῇ πατρίδι** *τὸν λόγον τοῦ* Κυρίου,

εἰσελθών *cett.* (*D*) διελέγετο *D* : διελέξατο Γ : διελέχθη *E* δ 20 δέ] τε *D* παρ' αὐτοῖς *DE* δ, *vg.*^{qw}, 𝔖, 𝔈^{vt} : ἐκεῖ 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈^{vg} : *om.* Γ, *vg.* 21 ἀλλά] + ἐκείνους κατέλιπεν ἐκεῖ 𝔈 ἀπετάξατο αὐτοῖς εἰπών δ, 𝔖^{ph} : ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς εἶπεν 𝔏^{g} : εἰπών (*om.* ἀλλ. ἀπετάξ. αὐτοῖς) 𝔖^{vg} : ἀποταξάμενος καὶ εἰπών *cett.* (*D*) δεῖ με (δέ *D*, me 𝔏^{d}) πάντως (*om.* πάντως 𝔏^{dg}) τὴν ἑορτὴν (+ ἡμέραν *D*) ἐρχομένην (*praem.* τήν δ) ποιῆσαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα *D* δ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{aqw}, 𝔖, *Cass.* : *om.* Γ *E*, *vg.*, 𝔈 ἀνακάμψω *D*, 𝔈 : πάλιν (*praem.* καί 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{q}, 𝔖^{vg}) ἀνακάμψω *cett.* 22 τὸν δὲ Ἀκύλαν (+ καὶ τὴν Πρίσκιλλαν 𝔖^{vg}) εἴασεν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ *c.Th.*, 𝔖^{vg} : ἀνήχθη (*praem.* καί *E*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph} : + δέ ℵ) ἀπὸ τῆς (τοῦ *D*) Ἐφέσου *cett.* (*D*) : καὶ ἀνήχθη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐφέσου τὸν δὲ Ἀκύλαν εἴασεν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ (*conflat.*) δ αὐτὸς δὲ ἀναχθείς (ἀνεχ. 614) *c.Th.* 614, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.* (*D*) ἦλθεν εἰς Καισάρειαν *c.Th.*, 𝔖^{vg} : καὶ κατελθὼν εἰς Καισ. *cett.* (*D* 614) καὶ ἀναβάς *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg} : ἀναβὰς δέ *c.Th.* : ἀναβάς *cett.* 23 διερχόμενος] διερχ. καί ℵ : καὶ διερχ. 𝔏^{g} Φρυγίαν καί *D* : Φρυγίαν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) ἐπιστηρίζων *DE* δ : στηρίζων Γ 24 ὀνόματι *ante* Ἀπολλ. *hab.* *D*, 𝔏^{g} : *post* Ἀπολλ. Γ *E* δ, *Aug.* Ἀπολλώνιος *D* : Ἀπολλώς (Ἀπελλῆς ℵ) *cett. Aug.* γένει Ἀλεξ. *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg} : Ἀλεξ. τῷ γένει *cett. Aug.* ἀνὴρ λόγιος *om. Aug.* 25 ὅς *D* : οὗτος *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) *Aug.* ἐν τῇ πατρίδι *D*, 𝔏^{g} : *om. cett. Aug.* τὸν λόγον *D c.Ath.* : τὴν ὁδόν *cett. Aug.* τοῦ *om.* *B* 614

καὶ ζέων τῷ πνεύματι ἀπελάλει καὶ ἐδίδασκεν
ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ,
ἐπιστάμενος μόνον τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου.
26 *οὗτος ἤρξατο παρρησιάζεσθαι ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ,*
καὶ ἀκούσαντες αὐτοῦ Ἀκύλας καὶ Πρίσκιλλα
προσελάβοντο αὐτὸν
καὶ ἀκριβέστερον αὐτῷ ἐξέθεντο τὴν ὁδόν.
27 **ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἐφέσῳ ἐπιδημοῦντές**
τινες Κορίνθιοι, καὶ ἀκούσαντες αὐτοῦ
παρεκάλουν διελθεῖν σὺν αὐτοῖς
εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτῶν.
συγκατανεύσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ
οἱ Ἐφέσιοι ἔγραψαν τοῖς ἐν Κορίνθῳ μαθηταῖς
ὅπως ἀποδέξωνται τὸν ἄνδρα·
ὃς ἐπιδημήσας **εἰς τὴν Ἀχαΐαν**
πολὺ συνεβάλλετο **ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις**
τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν διὰ τῆς χάριτος.
28 *εὐτόνως γὰρ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους διακατηλέγχετο*
δημοσίᾳ **διαλεγόμενος**
καὶ *ἐπιδεικνὺς διὰ τῶν γραφῶν τὸν Ἰησοῦν εἶναι Χριστόν.*

25 ἀπελάλει (eloquebatur) *D*, 𝔏^{g} : ᾧ ἐλάλει ℵ : ἐλάλει δέ *B* : ἐλάλει *AE* δ, *Aug.* Ἰησοῦ *D* : τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Γ *E* δ 26 οὗτος *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈 : οὗτός τε (δέ 𝔖^{ph} : ergo *vg.*) *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Aug.* παρρησιάζεσθαι] + ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου (*om.* τοῦ κ. *vg.*^{w}) *vg.*^{qw} τῇ *om. D* καὶ ἀκούσαντες *D*, 𝔖^{vg} : ἀκούσ. δέ *cett.* Ἀκύλας καὶ Πρίσκ. *D* δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, 𝔈, *Aug.* : Πρίσκ. καὶ Ἀκ. Γ *E* τὴν ὁδόν *D*, 𝔏^{g} : + τοῦ θεοῦ (κυρίου *E*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug.*) *cett.* 27 ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἐφέσῳ ἐπιδημοῦντές (in aephesum autem exeuntes 𝔏^{d} : ἐλθόντες δὲ εἰς Ἔφεσον *c.Th.*) τινες Κορίνθιοι . . . πατρίδα αὐτῶν *D c.Th.* : βουλομένου (φοβουμένου 614) δὲ αὐτοῦ διελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Ἀχαΐαν (εἰς τὴν Ἀχ. διελθεῖν *E*) *cett. Aug. Cass.* συγκατανεύσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ οἱ Ἐφέσιοι (οἱ ἀδελφοί *c.Th.*) ἔγραψαν . . . τὸν ἄνδρα *D c.Th.* : προτρεψάμενοι οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἔγραψαν τοῖς μαθηταῖς (ἀδελφοῖς 𝔈) ἀποδέξασθαι αὐτόν *cett. Aug.* ἐπιδημήσας *D* : παραγενόμενος Γ *E* δ εἰς τὴν Ἀχαΐαν *D pap.*, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett. Aug.* πολὺ συνεβάλλετο *D pap.*, *Aug.* : συνεβ. πολύ *cett.* ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις *D pap.* : *om. cett. Aug.* τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν διὰ τῆς χάριτος *om. D pap.* : διὰ τῆς χάριτος *om.* 614, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}, *Aug.* 28 κατηλέγχετο *E* δημοσίᾳ] + καὶ κατ' οἶκον *E* διαλεγόμενος καί (*om.* καί *pap.*) *D pap.* δ : *om. cett. Aug.* τὸν Ἰησοῦν εἶναι Χριστόν *D*, 𝔖, *Aug.* : Χριστὸν εἶναι Ἰησοῦν *pap.* : εἶναι τὸν (*om.* τόν *E*) Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν Γ *E* δ XIX 1 θέ-

XIX

1 **Θέλοντος δὲ τοῦ Παύλου**
κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν βουλὴν
πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα
εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ Πνεῦμα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν.
διελθὼν δὲ τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη
ἔρχεται εἰς Ἔφεσον,
2 *καὶ εὑρών τινας μαθητὰς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς·*
Εἰ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐλάβετε πιστεύσαντες;
οἱ δὲ πρὸς αὐτόν· Ἀλλ' οὐδ' εἰ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον **λαμβάνουσίν**
τινες *ἠκούσαμεν.*
3 *εἶπεν δε· Εἰς τί οὖν ἐβαπτίσθητε;*
οἱ δὲ ἔλεγον· Εἰς τὸ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα.
4 *εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Παῦλος· Ἰωάννης ἐβάπτισεν*
βάπτισμα μετανοίας, τῷ λαῷ λέγων
εἰς τὸν ἐρχόμενον μετ' αὐτὸν
ἵνα πιστεύσωσιν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν εἰς Χριστόν.
5 *ἀκούσαντες δὲ τοῦτο ἐβαπτίσθησαν*
εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ **Χριστοῦ**
εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

λοντος . . . ὑποστρέφειν (-φου *c.Th.*) εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν *D pap. c.Th., Ephr. Ado*: ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν Ἀπόλλω εἶναι ἐν Κορίνθῳ Παῦλον *cett. Hier. Cass.* διελθὼν δέ *D pap.* (?) *c.Th., Ado*: διελθόντα (perambulantes $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *cett.* ἔρχεται *D pap. c.Th., Petil. Ado*: κατελθεῖν (ἐλθ. *B* δ) *cett. Cass.* 2 καὶ εὑρών τινας μαθητὰς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: καὶ εὑρεῖν τινὰς μαθ. εἶπέν τε πρὸς αὐτούς Γ, *vg.*: καὶ [ειπεν τοι]ς μαθηταις *pap.* οἱ δὲ πρὸς αὐτόν] +εἶπον ℵ: οἱ δὲ ἀπεκρίθησαν (*sine* πρὸς αὐτόν) *Hier.*: οι δε απεκρειναντο προ]ς αυτō *pap. sec. Wilcken et Schubart*: το ιδιō [το]υ κῡ εινα[ι οι δε προ]ς αυτō *sec. Sanders*: responderunt et dixerunt ei $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ (*confl.*) οὐδ' εἰ] οὐδέ *D* λαμβάνουσίν τινες *D pap. c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{E}$: ἔστιν *cett. Orig. Hier. Petil.* 3 εἶπεν δέ *D*: εἶπέν τε *B*, $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$: ὁ δὲ εἶπεν ℵ *AE*: εἶπέν τε (δέ) πρὸς αὐτούς 383, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Hier.*: ὁ δὲ Παῦλος πρὸς αὐτούς *pap.* ἔλεγον *D pap.*: εἶπον (-παν) Γ *E* δ: ἀπεκρίθησαν $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Hier.* 4 ὁ Παῦλος *D*: Παῦλος *pap.* Γ *E* δ Ἰωάννης] +μέν *E* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Hier.*: +δέ $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ Χριστόν *D*: τὸν Ἰησοῦν (+Χριστόν $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$) *cett.* (*pap.*): +εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν *Hier. Amb.* 5 τοῦτο (ταῦτα $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Hier.*) *D pap.* (?), $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Hier.*: *om. cett.* τοῦ κυρίου *pap.* Γ *E* δ: κυρίου *D* Χριστοῦ *D pap.* (?) δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Hier. Petil.*: *om.* Γ *E*, *vg.* εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν *D pap.* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: *om. cett. Hier. Petil. Amb.*

6 *καὶ ἐπιθέντος αὐτοῖς χεῖρα τοῦ Παύλου,*
εὐθέως *ἐπέπεσεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς,*
ἐλάλουν τε γλώσσαις
⟨**καὶ ἐπεγίνωσκον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς**
ὥστε καὶ ἑρμηνεύειν αὐτὰς ἑαυτοῖς·
τινὲς δὲ⟩ *καὶ ἐπροφήτευον.*
7 *ἦσαν δὲ οἱ πάντες ἄνδρες ὡσεὶ δώδεκα.*
8 *εἰσελθὼν δὲ* **ὁ Παῦλος** *εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν*
ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλῃ *ἐπαρρησιάζετο*
ἐπὶ μῆνας τρεῖς διαλεγόμενος
καὶ πείθων περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ.
9 *τινὲς μὲν οὖν* **αὐτῶν** *ἐσκληρύνοντο*
καὶ ἠπείθουν κακολογοῦντες
τὴν ὁδὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ πλήθους **τῶν ἐθνῶν.**
τότε *ἀποστὰς* **ὁ Παῦλος** *ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν*
ἀφώρισεν τοὺς μαθητάς,
τὸ καθ᾽ ἡμέραν διαλεγόμενος ἐν τῇ σχολῇ
Τυράννου τινός, **ἀπὸ ὥρας πέμπτης ἕως δεκάτης.**
10 *τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ ἔτη δύο,*
ἕως πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν Ἀσίαν
ἤκουσαν τοὺς λόγους τοῦ Κυρίου,

6 χεῖρα τοῦ Παύλου *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Petil.*: το[υ πα[υλου χεῖρα] *pap.* (?): τοῦ Π. (+τάς *E* δ) χεῖρας Γ *E* δ   εὐθέως *D*: *om. cett.* (*pap.*)   ἐπέπεσεν *D pap.*, *Hier.*: ἦλθεν *cett. Petil.*   αὐτούς *cett.* (*pap.*, 𝔏^{d}): αὐτοῖς *D*   τε] δέ (*om.* 𝔏^{d}) *D*, *Petil.*   γλώσσαις] +aliis *c.Th.*: +variis *vg.*^{q}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Petil.*   καὶ ἐπεγίνωσκον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς *c.Th.*: *om. cett.* (*D*)   ὥστε καὶ (quod et *c.Th.*) ἑρμηνεύειν αὐτὰς (*om.* αὐτάς 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q}) ἑαυτοῖς *c.Th.*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q}, *Ephr.*: *om. cett.* (*D*), *Petil.* (*cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 10)   τινὲς δέ *c.Th.*: *om. cett.* (*D*), *Petil. Cass.*   προεφήτευον *E* δ   7 οἱ πάντες *om.* 𝔏^{g} 8 ὁ Παῦλος *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}: *om. cett.*   ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλῃ *D c.Th.*: *om. cett.*   9 τινὲς μὲν οὖν *D*, 𝔖^{vg}: ὡς δέ τινες *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) (+τῶν ἐθνῶν 383, +τῶν ἐθν. τότε 614)   αὐτῶν *D*, 𝔏^{g} 𝔖^{vg}: *om. cett.*   τὴν ὁδόν *cett.* (𝔏^{e}): τὸν λόγον *E*: +τοῦ κυρίου (θεοῦ 𝔖^{vg}) *E*, 𝔏^{g}, *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖^{vg} τῶν ἐθνῶν. τότε (*om.* τότε *E*) *D E*, 𝔖: *om. cett.*   ὁ Παῦλος *D*, 𝔖^{vg}: *om. cett.*   τό *D* δ: *om.* Γ *E*   Τυράννου *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): Τυραννίου *D*   τινός *cett.*: *om.* Γ, 𝔈   ἀπὸ ὥρας πέμπτης ἕως δεκάτης (ὥρας δεκ. δ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{aw}, 𝔖^{ph}) *D* δ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{aw}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Ambst.*: *om. cett.*   10 ἕως πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες . . . ἤκουσαν *D*, 𝔏^{e}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Ephr.*: ὥστε πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας . . . ἀκοῦσαι *cett.* (*E*, 𝔏^{d})   τοὺς λόγους *D*: τὸν λόγον *cett.*   κυρίου] +Ἰησοῦ δ   Ἰουδαῖοι

Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ Ἕλληνες.
11 δυνάμεις δὲ οὐ τὰς τυχούσας ὁ Θεὸς ἐποίει
διὰ τῶν χειρῶν Παύλου,
12 ὥστε καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας
ἐπιφέρεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ χρωτὸς αὐτοῦ
σουδάρια ἢ σιμικίνθια,
καὶ ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν τὰς νόσους,
τά τε πνεύματα τὰ πονηρὰ ἐκπορεύεσθαι.
13 ἐπεχείρησαν δέ τινες ἐκ τῶν περιερχομένων
Ἰουδαίων ἐξορκιστῶν ὀνομάζειν
ἐπὶ τοὺς ἔχοντας τὰ πνεύματα τὰ πονηρὰ
τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ λέγοντες·
Ὁρκίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν Παῦλος κηρύσσει.
14 ἐν οἷς καὶ υἱοὶ Σκευᾶ τινος ἱερέως
ἠθέλησαν τὸ αὐτὸ ποιῆσαι·
ἔθος εἶχαν ἐξορκίζειν τοὺς τοιούτους,
καὶ εἰσελθόντες πρὸς τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον
ἤρξαντο ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα λέγοντες·
Παραγγέλλομέν σοι ἐν Ἰησοῦ
ὃν Παῦλος κηρύσσει ἐξελθεῖν.
15 τότε ἀπεκρίθη τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·

(+τε $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) καὶ Ἕλληνες *D*, *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας *cett.* 11 δέ *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: τε *cett.* ἐποίει ὁ θεός δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}$ 12 ἐπιφέρεσθαι *D* δ : ἀποφέρεσθαι Γ *E* : ut . . . deferrent et ponerent $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$ ἢ *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) : ἢ καί *D* 13 ἐκ τῶν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: καὶ τῶν *cett.* : κ[αι ἐκ τῶν] *pap.* (?) τοῦ κυρίου *pap.* Γ *E* δ : κυρίου *D* ὁρκίζω *cett.* (*D*) : ἐξορκίζομεν *pap.* δ (*pluralem tuentur vg.*^{a}, $\mathfrak{S}$) Ἰησοῦν] κύριον Ιησοῦν ℵ *E*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν *vg.*^{a} : θεόν 614 κηρύσσει] + ἐξελθεῖν $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ 14 ἐν οἷς καὶ υἱοὶ Σκευᾶ τινος ἱερέως *D* : ἐν οἷς υἱοὶ ἑπτὰ Σκευᾶ τινος ἱερέως *c.Th.* : ἦσαν δὲ υἱοὶ Σκευᾶ δύο ἱερέως $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ἐν οἷς καὶ υ[ιοι] ιο[υ . .]δαιου τινος αρχιερέως *pap.* (*sec. Sanders*) : ἦσαν δέ τινος (τινες ℵ *A* δ, *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}$) Σκεῦα Ἰουδαίου ἀρχιερέως (archisynagogi *Cass.*) ἑπτὰ υἱοὶ *cett.* ἠθέλησαν τὸ αὐτὸ ποιῆσαι *D pap. c.Th.* : ποιοῦντες τὸ αὐτό $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: τοῦτο ποιοῦντες *cett.* ἔθος . . . ἐξελθεῖν *D pap. c.Th.*, *vg.*^{w}, *Cass.*, *cf. Ephr.* : *om. cett.* ἔθος ἔχοντες *pap.* (qui soliti erant *c.Th.*) ἐξορκίζειν τοὺς τοιούτους *pap. c.Th.* : τοὺς τοιούτους ἐξορκίζ. *D* τόν *ante* δαιμον. *om. pap.* Παῦλος] + ὁ ἀπόστολος *pap.* κηρύσσει ἐξελθεῖν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) : ἐξελθεῖν κηρ. *D* 15 τότε ἀπεκρίθη τὸ πν. τὸ πον. (+καί D^{2}) εἶπεν *D* : ἀποκριθὲν δὲ (+ποτε 614, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$) τὸ πν. τὸ πον. εἶπεν *cett.* (*pap.* ?) αὐτοῖς *om.* *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

Τὸν Ἰησοῦν γινώσκω καὶ τὸν Παῦλον ἐπίσταμαι·
ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνες ἐστέ;
16 καὶ ἐναλλόμενος ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὁ ἄνθρωπος
ἐν ᾧ ἦν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν
κυριεύσας ἀμφοτέρων ἴσχυσεν κατ' αὐτῶν,
ὥστε γυμνοὺς καὶ τετραυματισμένους
ἐκφυγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου ἐκείνου.
17 τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο γνωστὸν πᾶσιν Ἰουδαίοις
καὶ Ἕλλησιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν τὴν Ἔφεσον,
καὶ φόβος ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ πάντας αὐτούς,
καὶ ἐμεγαλύνετο τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.
18 πολλοὶ δὲ τῶν πιστευόντων
ἤρχοντο ἐξομολογούμενοι
καὶ ἀναγγέλλοντες τὰς πράξεις αὐτῶν.
19 ἱκανοὶ δὲ τῶν τὰ περίεργα πραξάντων
συνενέγκαντες τὰς βίβλους
κατέκαιον ἐνώπιον πάντων·
καὶ συνεψήφισαν τὰς τιμὰς αὐτῶν
καὶ εὗρον ἀργυρίου μυριάδας πέντε·
20 οὕτως κατὰ κράτος ἐνίσχυσεν
ἡ πίστις τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ηὔξανεν **καὶ ἐπληθύνετο.**
21 *ὡς δὲ ἐπληρώθη ταῦτα,*

15 *τὸν μὲν Ἰησοῦν BE* δ, 𝔖ph, *Cass.* *τίνες ἐστέ*] + *οὐκ οἶδα vg.*[a], *Cass.* 16 *ἐναλλόμενος D*: *ἐφαλόμενος* (*ἐφαλλ. E* δ) Γ *E* δ (*pap. lac. est*) *ἐπ' αὐτούς* (-*τοῖς E*) *cett.* (ϵ]π α[υτους *pap.*): εἰς *αὐτούς D* (*vocc. ante ὁ ἄνθρ. hab. D* 383, 𝔏g *vg.*, 𝔖vg: *post ὁ ἄνθρ.* Γ 614, 𝔖ph (*pap.* ?): *post πονηρόν E*) *κυριεύσας D*: *κατακυριεύσας* (-*σαν AE* 383) Γ *E* δ *ἀμφοτέρων*] *αὐτῶν* 383, 𝔖vg: *πάντων* 𝔖ph: τῶν *ἑπτά* 𝔈: *om. E* 17 *πᾶσιν*] + τοῖς *E* *καί DE*: τε *καί* Γ δ *τήν om. E* δ *φόβος ἔπεσεν D*, 𝔏g: ἐπέπεσεν (*ἔπεσεν A* 383) *φόβος* (*ὁ φόβ.* ℵ) *cett.* (𝔏d) *τοῦ κυρίου*] *κυρίου D* 18 *δέ D*, 𝔏g: τε *cett.* (𝔏d) *πιστευόντων D* 614: πιστευσάντων *E*: *πεπιστευκότων cett.* *ἤρξαντο ἐξομολογεῖσθαι c. Th.* 19 *δέ* (τε *E* 614, 𝔖ph) *cett.* (𝔏d): *om. D* τὰ *περίεργα cett.* (𝔏d): περὶ τὰ *ἔργα D* *τάς*] *καὶ τάς D* *κατέκαυσαν E* *συγκατεψήφισαν E* *καὶ εὗρον cett.*: *εὗρον D* 20 *κατὰ κράτος om.* 614, 𝔈 *ἐνίσχυσεν D*: corroborabatur 𝔖vg: *ηὔξανεν cett.* *ἡ* (*καὶ ἡ D*) *πίστις τοῦ θεοῦ D*, 𝔖vg: τοῦ *κυρίου ὁ λόγος cett.* καὶ (*om. D*) *ηὔξανεν D*, 𝔖vg: καὶ *ἴσχυεν cett.* καὶ ἐπληθύνϵ[το] *D*: et praevalebat 𝔈: *om. cett.* 21 ὡς δὲ ἐπληρώθη (-*θησαν*

Παῦλος ἔθετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι
διελθεῖν τὴν Μακεδονίαν
καὶ τὴν Ἀχαΐαν
καὶ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα,
εἰπὼν ὅτι Μετὰ τὸ γενέσθαι με ἐκεῖ
δεῖ με καὶ Ῥώμην ἰδεῖν.
22 καὶ ἀποστείλας εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν
δύο τῶν διακονούντων αὐτῷ,
Τιμόθεον καὶ Ἔραστον,
αὐτὸς ἐπέσχεν χρόνον **ὀλίγον** ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ.
23 ἐγένετο δὲ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον
τάραχος οὐκ ὀλίγος περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ.
24 Δημήτριος γάρ τις **ἦν** ἀργυροκόπος,
ποιῶν ναοὺς ἀργυροῦς Ἀρτέμιδος,
ὃς παρεῖχεν τοῖς τεχνίταις
οὐκ ὀλίγην ἐργασίαν.
25 **οὗτος** συναθροίσας τοὺς περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα
τεχνίτας ἔφη **πρὸς αὐτούς**·
Ἄνδρες **συντεχνῖται**, ἐπίστασθε ὅτι ἐκ ταύτης
τῆς ἐργασίας ἡ εὐπορία ἡμῖν ἐστίν,
26 καὶ ἀκούετε καὶ θεωρεῖτε ὅτι
οὐ μόνον **ἕως** Ἐφέσου

E) ταῦτα] τότε *D* Παῦλος (ὁ Π. *E*) ἔθετο *DE* : ἔθετο ὁ Παῦλος *cett.* διελθεῖν *DAE*, 𝕷^{g} *vg.*^{aq}, 𝕾^{vg} : διελθών *cett.* *Orig.* καὶ τήν *DAE* : καί ℵ *B* δ καὶ πορεύεσθαι (et sic ire 𝕷^{dg}) *D*, 𝕷^{g} *vg.*^{aq} : πορεύεσθαι *cett.* 22 καὶ ἀποστείλας (et misit 𝕷^{dg}) *D*, 𝕷^{g} 𝕾^{vg} : ἀποστείλας δέ *cett.* τήν *om.* ℵ *E* δ αὐτός] ipse vero 𝕷^{dg} ὀλίγον *D* : *om. cett.* (𝕷^{d}) ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ *D*, 𝕷^{g} : εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν *cett.* (𝕷^{d}) 23 οὐχ ὀλίγος *D* ℵ *A* ὁδοῦ] + τοῦ κυρίου (θεοῦ 𝕾) 𝕷^{dg} *vg.*^{a}, 𝕾, *Cass.* 24 τις ἦν *D*, 𝕾^{vg} : τις 𝕷^{dg} : τις ὀνόματι *cett.* ναοὺς ἀργυροῦς] ναούς *B*, 𝕷^{g} : ναὸν ἀργυροῦν ℵ ὅς *D*, *vg.*^{q} (iste *Cass.*) : ὅ *Bl.* : *om. cett.* παρεῖχεν *DE* : παρείχετο Γ δ ἐργασίαν οὐκ ὀλίγην *E* δ 25 οὗτος *D* 614, 𝕷^{g} *vg.*^{a}, 𝕾, 𝕰 : οὕς *cett.* τούς *D* 614, 𝕷^{g} : καὶ τούς Γ 383, *vg.*, 𝕾^{ph} : πάντας τούς 𝕾^{vg}, 𝕰, *Bl.* τεχνίτας *D* : ἐργάτας Γ *E* δ : ἐργάτας καὶ συντεχνίτας 𝕾^{vg} ἔφη *D* : εἶπεν Γ *E* δ πρὸς αὐτούς *D*, 𝕾^{vg}, 𝕰 : *om. cett.* συντεχνῖται *D*, 𝕾^{ph}, 𝕰 : *om. cett.* 26 ἀκούετε καὶ θεωρεῖτε *D*, 𝕾^{vg} : θεωρ. καὶ ἀκούετε *cett.* ὅτι *cett.* (𝕷^{d}) : *om.* *D* ἕως (ipsius 𝕷^{d} = τῆς, *cf. infra*) *D* : *om. cett.* Ἐφέσου] Ἐφεσίου *D* : Ἐφεσίοις 𝕷^{g}, 𝕾^{vg}

ἀλλὰ **καὶ** σχεδὸν πάσης τῆς Ἀσίας
ὁ Παῦλος οὗτος **τίς ποτε** πείσας
μετέστησεν ἱκανὸν ὄχλον, λέγων
ὅτι **Οὗτοι** οὐκ εἰσὶν Θεοὶ
οἱ διὰ χειρῶν γενόμενοι.
27 οὐ μόνον δὲ τοῦτο ἡμῖν κινδυνεύει
τὸ μέρος εἰς ἀπελεγμὸν ἐλθεῖν,
ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τῆς μεγάλης θεᾶς
ἱερὸν Ἀρτέμιδος εἰς οὐδὲν λογισθήσεται,
καὶ καθαιρεῖσθαι μέλλει
ἡ μεγαλειότης αὐτῆς, ἣν ὅλη ἡ Ἀσία
καὶ ἡ οἰκουμένη σέβεται.
28 ταῦτα δὲ ἀκούσαντες
καὶ γενόμενοι πλήρεις θυμοῦ
δραμόντες εἰς τὸ ἄμφοδον ἔκραζον λέγοντες·
Μεγάλη Ἄρτεμις Ἐφεσίων.
29 καὶ συνεχύθη ὅλη ἡ πόλις,
ὥρμησάν τε ὁμοθυμαδὸν εἰς τὸ θέατρον,
συναρπάσαντες Γάϊον καὶ Ἀρίσταρχον,
Μακεδόνας, συνεκδήμους Παύλου.
30 βουλομένου δὲ τοῦ Παύλου
εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν δῆμον

26 ἀλλὰ καί *DA*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ἀλλά *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$)   σχεδόν *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ τῆς *om. D*   τίς ποτε *Bl.* : τις τότε *D* : nescio quem $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *om. cett.*   ἀπέστησεν *E*   οὗτοι *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$)   γενόμενοι *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: γινόμενοι *cett.*   27 ἡμῖν κινδυνεύει *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: κινδυνεύει (-εύσει ℵ, *vg.*) ἡμῖν *cett.*   μεγάλης θεᾶς ἱερὸν Ἀρτέμιδος *DE*, *Hier.* : μεγ. θεᾶς Ἀρτ. ἱερόν Γ δ : ἱερὸν μεγ. θεᾶς Ἀρτ. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$ (*om.* θεᾶς *vg.*, $\mathfrak{E}$)   λογισθῆναι ℵ *B* δ   καὶ (*ita* $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, ἀλλά *D*, ἀλλὰ καί $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, *cf. supr.*) καθαιρεῖσθαι μέλλει *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: μέλλειν τε καὶ (*om.* καί *E* δ) καθαιρεῖσθαι *cett.*   ἡ μεγαλειότης αὐτῆς ἥν $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Hier.* : τῆς (τήν 383) μεγαλειότητος (-τητα 383) αὐτῆς ἥν *cett.* : *om. D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ ἣν ὅλη ἡ] ἡ ὅλη *D*   28 ταῦτα δὲ ἀκούσαντες *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ἀκούσ. δέ *cett.*   δραμόντες εἰς τὸ ἄμφοδον *D c.Th.* δ : *om. cett.*   Ἄρτεμις *D* : ἡ Ἄρτεμις Γ *E* δ   29 καὶ συνεχύθη ὅλη ἡ πόλις (+ αἰσχύνης *D* = *confusionis, ex* $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ *illatum*) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}^{vt}$: καὶ ἐπλήσθη ἡ πόλις (+ ὅλη *E* δ) τῆς (*om.* τῆς *E*) συγχύσεως *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) : erat autem totius civitatis magna confusio *Cass.*   ὥρμησαν] impetu facto irruerunt $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ τε *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) : δέ *D*   συναρπάσαντες] καὶ συναρπάσαντες *D* : καὶ συνήρπασαν $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$ 30 βουλο-

οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐκώλυον.
31 τινὲς δὲ καὶ τῶν Ἀσιαρχῶν,
ὑπάρχοντες αὐτῷ φίλοι,
πέμψαντες πρὸς αὐτὸν
παρεκάλουν μὴ δοῦναι ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ θέατρον.
32 ἄλλοι μὲν οὖν ἄλλο ἔκραζον,
ἡ γὰρ ἐκκλησία ἦν συγκεχυμένη,
καὶ οἱ πλεῖστοι οὐκ ᾔδεισαν τίνος ἕνεκεν
33 συνεληλύθεισαν. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ὄχλου
κατεβίβασαν Ἀλέξανδρον,
προβαλλόντων αὐτὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων,
ὁ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος κατασείσας τῇ χειρὶ
ἤθελεν ἀπολογεῖσθαι τῷ δήμῳ.
34 ἐπιγνόντες δὲ ὅτι Ἰουδαῖός ἐστιν
φωνὴ ἐγένετο μία πάντων
ὡς ἐπὶ ὥρας δύο κραζόντων·
Μεγάλη Ἄρτεμις Ἐφεσίων.
35 καταστείλας δὲ ὁ γραμματεὺς τὸν ὄχλον φησίν·
Ἄνδρες Ἐφέσιοι, τίς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος
ὃς οὐ γινώσκει τὴν ἡμετέραν πόλιν
νεωκόρον εἶναι τῆς μεγάλης Ἀρτέμιδος
36 καὶ τοῦ διοπετοῦς; ἀναντιρρήτων

μενου δὲ τοῦ Παύλου *D*, 𝔏^{g}: Παύλου δὲ (τοῦ δὲ Π. *E* δ) βουλομένου *cett.* οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐκώλυον (non sinebant 𝔏^{d}) *D*: οὐκ εἴων (ἐκώλυον 𝔖^{vg}) αὐτὸν (*om.* αὐτόν 𝔏^{g} *vg.*) οἱ μαθηταί *cett. Cass.* 31 ὑπάρχοντες *D*: ὄντες Γ *E* δ (constituti 𝔏^{e}) δοῦναι *post* θέατρον *hab.* 𝔏^{g} 32 ἄλλο *D*, 𝔏^{g}: ἄλλο τι *cett.* ἡ γὰρ ἐκκλησία ἦν *D*: ἦν γὰρ ἡ ἐκκλ. *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) πλεῖστοι *D*: πλείους *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) ἕνεκεν *DE* 614: ἕνεκα Γ 383 33 κατεβίβασαν *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*: συνεβίβασαν Γ *E*: προεβίβασαν δ προβαλλόντων *D* δ: προβαλόντων Γ *E* τῇ χειρί *D*: τὴν χεῖρα Γ *E* δ ἤθελεν] ἦλθεν ℵ *BE* δήμῳ] λαῷ *E* 34 πάντων *D*, 𝔏^{g}: ἐκ πάντων *cett.* μεγάλη . . . Ἐφεσίων *bis scr. B.* Ἄρτεμις *D*: ἡ Ἄρτεμις Γ *E* δ 35 καταστείλας *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): κατασείσας *DE* 614 τὸν ὄχλον φησίν (ἔφη *E*) *cett.*: ἔφη πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον 𝔏^{g} ὁ ἄνθρωπος *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.*: ἀνθρώπων *cett.* ἡμετέραν (vestram 𝔏^{d}) *D*, *Ephr.*: Ἐφεσίων *cett.* (*utramque lectionem agnoscit Chr.* xlii. 2) νεωκόρον] ναοκόρον *D* εἶναι *D*: οὖσαν Γ *E* δ διοπετοῦς] διοσπετοῦς *D*: Διός 𝔏^{dg}, ℭ: Iovisque prolis *vg.*

οὖν ὄντων τούτων
δέον ἐστὶν ὑμᾶς κατεσταλμένους ὑπάρχειν
καὶ μηδὲν προπετὲς πράσσειν.
37 *ἠγάγετε γὰρ τοὺς ἄνδρας τούτους* **ἐνθάδε**
μήτε ἱεροσύλους
μήτε βλασφημοῦντας τὴν θεὰν ἡμῶν.
38 *εἰ μὲν οὖν Δημήτριος* **οὗτος**
καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ τεχνῖται
ἔχουσιν πρὸς αὐτούς τινα λόγον,
ἀγοραῖοι ἄγονται, καὶ ἀνθύπατοί εἰσιν·
ἐγκαλείτωσαν ἀλλήλοις.
39 *εἰ δέ τι περὶ ἑτέρων ἐπιζητεῖτε,*
ἐν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπιλυθήσεται.
40 *καὶ γὰρ κινδυνεύομεν σήμερον ἐγκαλεῖσθαι*
στάσεως, μηδενὸς αἰτίου ὄντος,
περὶ οὗ οὐ δυνησόμεθα ἀποδοῦναι λόγον
τῆς συστροφῆς ταύτης.
41 *καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἀπέλυσεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.*

XX

1 Μετὰ δὲ τὸ *παύσασθαι τὸν θόρυβον*

36 οὖν *om. E* 37 ἐνθάδε *D c.Th.* δ, 𝔈 : *om. cett.* μητε . . . μήτε *D*: οὔτε . . . οὔτε Γ *E* δ θεάν *D* 614, *Chr.* : θεόν Γ *E* 383 ὑμῶν *E* 383, *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Chr.* 38 οὗτος *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* καὶ οἱ *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) : οἱ καί *D* πρὸς αὐτούς τινα λόγον *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Ephr.* : πρός τινα λόγον *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$), *Cass.* : τινα λόγον 𝔈 39 περὶ ἑτέρων] περαιτέρω *B*, $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$: περ ετερον *E* τῇ ἐννόμῳ] τῷ νόμῳ *D* 40 σήμερον ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως *D* : ἐγκαλ. στάσεως περὶ (*om.* περί *vg.*) τῆς σήμερον *cett.* ὄντος *D* : ὑπάρχοντος Γ *E* δ οὗ οὐ] οὗ *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.* τῆς *D*, *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: περὶ τῆς *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) (τῆς συστ. ταύτης *om.* 𝔈) XX 1 προσκαλεσάμενος] μεταπεμψάμενος ℵ *BE*, 𝔈 ὁ *om. D* πολλά *D* : *om. cett.* παρακελεύσας (-ε||σας) *D* : παρακαλέσας *cett.* ἀσπασάμενος *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) : ἀποσπασάμενος *D* (ἀπασπασάμενος *Bl.*) ἐξῆλθεν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: + πορεύεσθαι (πορευθῆναι δ) *cett.* 2 πάντα *D* : *om. cett.* χρησάμενος *D* : παρακαλέσας αὐτούς (*om.* αὐτούς $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) λόγῳ πολλῷ] πολλῷ λόγῳ $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.* 3 δέ *D* : τε *cett.* καὶ γενηθείσης . . . Ἰουδαίων *post* ἠθέλησεν . . . Συρίαν *transp. Bl. et* δέ *post* εἶπεν *om.* καὶ γενηθείσης (-εις *D*) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: γενομένης *cett.*

προσκαλεσάμενος ὁ Παῦλος τοὺς μαθητὰς
καὶ **πολλὰ** *παρακελεύσας*
ἀσπασάμενος ἐξῆλθεν εἰς Μακεδονίαν.
2 *διελθὼν δὲ* **πάντα** *τὰ μέρη ἐκεῖνα*
καὶ χρησάμενος λόγῳ πολλῷ
3 *ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν* Ἑλλάδα. *ποιήσας δὲ μῆνας τρεῖς*
καὶ γενηθείσης αὐτῷ ἐπιβουλῆς ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων
ἠθέλησεν ἀναχθῆναι εἰς Συρίαν,
εἶπεν δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα *αὐτῷ ὑποστρέφειν*
διὰ τῆς Μακεδονίας.
4 **μέλλοντος οὖν ἐξιέναι αὐτοῦ**
συνείποντο αὐτῷ *μέχρι τῆς* Ἀσίας
Σώπατρος Πύρρου Βεροιαῖος,
Θεσσαλονικέων *δὲ* Ἀρίσταρχος
καὶ Σεκοῦνδος, *καὶ* Γάϊος
Δοβήριος, *καὶ* Τιμόθεος·
Ἐφέσιοι *δὲ* Τυχικὸς *καὶ* Τρόφιμος,
5 *οὗτοι προελθόντες ἔμενον αὐτὸν ἐν* Τρῳάδι.
6 *ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐξεπλεύσαμεν*
μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν ἀζύμων
ἀπὸ Φιλίππων, *καὶ ἤλθομεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς*
εἰς τὴν Τρῳάδα *πεμπταῖοι*,

αὐτῷ ἐπιβουλῆς *D* δ, *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}: ἐπιβ. αὐτῷ *cett.* ἠθέλησεν ἀναχθῆναι εἰς Συρίαν (in Syriam perduci 𝔏^{d}) *D c.Th.*, *Ephr.*: μέλλων (+τε 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph}) ἄγεσθαι εἰς τὴν Συρ. *E*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph}: μέλλοντι ἀνάγεσθαι εἰς τὴν Συρ. Γ δ εἶπεν δὲ (τε 𝔏^{d}) τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῷ ὑποστρέφειν *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{g}, *Ephr.*: ἐγένετο γνώμης (-μη δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.*) τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν *cett. Chr.* τῆς *D*: *om.* Γ *E* δ 4 μέλλοντος οὖν ἐξιέναι αὐτοῦ *D c.Th.* (volente autem comitari eum 𝔏^{d}): *om. cett.* συνείποντο αὐτῷ *c.Th.*: *om. D*: προήρχοντο *Bl.*: συνείπετο (-ποντο 𝔏^{g}) δὲ αὐτῷ *cett.* μέχρι (ἄχρι *AE* δ) τῆς Ἀσίας *cett.*: *om.* ℵ *B*, 𝔈 Σωσίπατρος 383, *vg.*^{aw}, 𝔈, *Orig.*^{lat} Πύρρου *om.* δ, 𝔖, *Chr.* Δοβήριος] Δουβ||ριος (douerius 𝔏^{d}) *D*: Doberius 𝔏^{g}: Δερβαῖος *cett.* (*cf.* xix. 29) καί] δέ *Valckenaer*, *Bl.* Τιμόθεος] +Ἐφέσιος δ, +Λυστρεύς 𝔖^{vg} Ἐφέσιοι *D*, 𝔈: Ἀσιανοί *cett.*: ἐξ Ἀσίας Ἐφέσιοι *c.Th.* Τυχικός] Εὔτυχος *D* 5 οὗτοι *D* 383, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}: οὗτοι δέ *cett.* προελθόντες *D* 614, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈: προσελθόντες *cett.* αὐτόν *D*: ἡμᾶς *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): *om.* 614 6 πρὸς αὐτούς *om.* 𝔖^{vg}, *Iren.* τήν *om. D* πεμπταῖοι *D*: ἄχρι (ἄχρις δ, ἀπό ℵ *E*) ἡμερῶν πέντε Γ *E* δ: *om. Iren.*

ἐν ᾗ καὶ διετρίψαμεν ἡμέρας ἑπτά.
7 *ἐν δὲ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων*
συνηγμένων ἡμῶν τοῦ κλάσαι ἄρτον
ὁ Παῦλος διελέγετο αὐτοῖς
μέλλων ἐξιέναι τῇ ἐπαύριον,
παρέτεινέν τε τὸν λόγον μέχρι μεσονυκτίου.
8 *ἦσαν δὲ ὑπολαμπάδες ἱκαναὶ*
ἐν τῷ ὑπερῴῳ οὗ ἦμεν συνηγμένοι.
9 *καθεζόμενος δέ τις νεανίας,*
ὀνόματι Εὔτυχος, ἐπὶ τῇ θυρίδι,
κατεχόμενος ὕπνῳ βαρεῖ,
διαλεγομένου Παύλου ἐπὶ πλεῖον,
κατενεχθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου
ἔπεσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ τριστέγου κάτω
καὶ ἤρθη νεκρός.
10 *καταβὰς δὲ ὁ Παῦλος ἔπεσέν ἐπ' αὐτῷ*
καὶ συμπεριλαβὼν καὶ εἰπών· Μὴ θορυβεῖσθε·
ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐστίν·
ἤγαγεν τὸν νεανίσκον ζῶντα,
καὶ παρεκλήθησαν οὐ μετρίως.
11 *ἀναβὰς δὲ καὶ κλάσας τὸν ἄρτον*

6 *ἐν ᾗ καί* (*om. καί* 𝔏^{d}) *D* : *οὗ καί* δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *Iren.* : *ὅπου* (*οὗ B*) *cett.* 7 *δέ cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : *τε D* *τῇ* (*om. E* 383) *μιᾷ cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : *τῇ μιᾷ πρώτῃ D* *ἡμῶν*] *τῶν μαθητῶν* ℵ 383 *τοῦ D* : *om.* Γ *E* δ *αὐτοῖς*] + *καὶ ἐπεστήριζεν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν* 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{w}, *Bl.* (*cf.* xiv. 22) *μέλλων*] *καὶ μέλλων* 𝔏^{g}, *Bl.* *τῇ ἐπαύριον*] alia die 𝔏^{g}, *Aug.* : post alia die 𝔏^{d} *τε cett.* (𝔏^{d}) *Aug.* : *om. D*, 𝔏^{g} 8 *ὑπολαμπάδες D* : *λαμπάδες* Γ *E* δ *ἦμεν*] *ἦσαν* 𝔖^{vg} *συνηγμένοι om. E* 9 *νεανίσκος* 614 (*om. E*) *τῇ θυρίδι D* : *τῆς θυρίδος* Γ *E* 614 (*om.* 383) *κατεχόμενος D* : *καταφερόμενος* Γ *E* δ, *Orig.* *βαρεῖ D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug.* : *βαθεῖ cett. Orig.* *Παύλου D* : *τοῦ Π.* Γ *E* δ *ἐπὶ πλέον*] perplexius 𝔏^{g} (prolixius 𝔏^{d}) *ὑπό D* 383 : *ἀπό* Γ *E* 614 *πεσών E* *καί cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : *om. E* : *καὶ ὅς D*, *fort.* *ὅς καί* (*cf.* I. 5) 10 *ἔπεσεν ἐπ' αὐτῷ D* : *ἐπέπεσεν αὐτῷ* Γ *E* δ *συμπεριλαβών*] + *αὐτοῦ C*, 𝔖, 𝔈 *καὶ εἰπών scripsi* : *καὶ εἶπεν D* : *εἶπεν cett.* *ἤγαγεν* (*sim.*) . . . *μετρίως hoc loco hab. Cass.*, *post ἀσπαζ. δὲ αὐτῶν* (*v.* 12) *D*, *post ἐξῆλθεν* (*v.* 11) *cett.* *ἤγαγεν D*, *Cass.* : *ἤγαγον* 𝔏^{d}, 𝔖^{ph} : *ἤγαγον δέ* (*τε* 614) *cett.* *νεανίσκον D* : *παῖδα* Γ *E* δ 11 *ἀναβὰς δέ* (*om. δέ* 𝔏^{d}) *cett.* : *καὶ ἀναβάς* 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}

καὶ γευσάμενος ἐφ' ἱκανόν τε ὁμιλήσας
ἄχρις αὐγῆς οὕτως ἐξῆλθεν.
12 **ἀσπαζομένων δὲ αὐτῶν,**
13 *ἡμεῖς κατελθόντες εἰς τὸ πλοῖον*
ἀνήχθημεν εἰς τὴν Ἄσσον,
ἐκεῖθεν μέλλοντες ἀναλαμβάνειν τὸν Παῦλον,
οὕτως γὰρ ἦν διατεταγμένος
ὡς *μέλλων αὐτὸς πεζεύειν.*
14 *ὡς δὲ συνέβαλεν ἡμῖν εἰς τὴν Ἄσσον,*
ἀναλαβόντες αὐτὸν ἤλθομεν εἰς Μιτυλήνην,
15 *κἀκεῖθεν ἀποπλεύσαντες τῇ ἐπιούσῃ*
κατηντήσαμεν ἄντικρυς Χίου,
τῇ δὲ ἑτέρᾳ παρεβάλομεν εἰς Σάμον,
καὶ μείναντες ἐν Τρωγυλίᾳ
τῇ ἐχομένῃ ἤλθομεν εἰς Μίλητον·
16 *κεκρίκει γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος*
παραπλεῦσαι τὴν Ἔφεσον,
μήποτε γενηθῇ αὐτῷ κατάσχεσίς τις ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ.
ἔσπευδεν γὰρ εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πεντηκοστῆς,
εἰ δυνατὸν εἴη αὐτῷ,
γενέσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.

καὶ κλάσας] κλάσας *B*, 𝔏^{g}, *Aug.* τόν *om.* *E* δ τε *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : δέ *DE* ἄχρις *DC* δ : ἄχρι ℵ *AB* οὕτως *om.* 𝔏^{g} ἐξῆλθεν] + μέλλων αὐτὸς πεζεύειν (*ex v.* 13) 𝔖^{vg} 12 ἀσπαζομένων δὲ αὐτῶν *D* : *om. cett.* 13 ἡμεῖς *scripsi* : ἡμεῖς δέ *codd.* (*D*), *cf.* xii. 22 ὁ [δὲ] δῆμος (ἐγὼ Λουκᾶς καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοί *pro* ἡμεῖς *hab. Ephr.*) κατελθόντες *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg} : προελθ. ℵ *C* 383, 𝔈 : προσελθ. *ABE* 614 εἰς τό *D* : ἐπὶ τό Γ *E* δ εἰς τὴν *D* δ : ἐπὶ τήν Γ *E* Ἄσσον] Θάσον 614, 𝔖, 𝔈 (*ita mox*), *cf.* xxvii. 13 ἦν διατεταγμένος *D* δ : διατεταγμένος (ἐντεταλμένος *C*) ἦν Γ *E* ὡς *D* : *om. cett.* (𝔏^{d}) 14 συνέβαλεν *DC* δ : συνέβαλλεν (-ον ℵ) ℵ *ABE* 15 ἑτέρᾳ] ἑσπέρᾳ *B* παρεβάλομεν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : παρελάβομεν *D* 614 καὶ μείναντες ἐν Τρωγυλίᾳ (-υλίῳ, -ιλίῳ, -υλλίῳ) *D* δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, 𝔈 : *om.* Γ *E*, *vg. Cass.* τῇ *D* δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖 : τῇ δέ Γ *E* ἐρχομένῃ *D* 614 16 μήποτε *D* : ὅπως μή *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) γενηθῇ *D* : γένηται Γ *E* δ κατάσχεσίς τις *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.* : χρονοτριβῆσαι *cett.* : commorandi quis 𝔏^{d} εἰς τήν *D* : τήν Γ *E* δ εἰ δυνατὸν εἴη (ἦν δ) αὐτῷ *post* γάρ *hab. cett.* : *om.* *D* : *post* πεντηκ. *inserui* γενέσθαι] ποιῆσαι 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖 εἰς Γ *E* δ : ἐν *D* Ἱερουσαλήμ ℵ *AE*

17 *ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Μιλήτου πέμψας εἰς Ἔφεσον*
μετεκαλέσατο τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας.
18 *ὡς δὲ παρεγένοντο πρὸς αὐτόν,*
ὁμῶς ὄντων αὐτῶν *εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς·*
Ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε, **ἀδελφοί,** *ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας*
ἀφ' ἧς ἐπέβην εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν,
ὡς τριετίαν ἢ καὶ πλεῖον
ποταπῶς μεθ' ὑμῶν ἦν
19 *διὰ παντὸς χρόνου, δουλεύων τῷ Κυρίῳ*
μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης
καὶ δακρύων καὶ πειρασμῶν
τῶν συμβάντων μοι
ἐν ταῖς ἐπιβουλαῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων·
20 *ὡς οὐδὲν ὑπεστειλάμην τῶν συμφερόντων*
τοῦ ἀναγγεῖλαι ὑμῖν
καὶ διδάξαι κατ' οἴκους καὶ δημοσίᾳ,
21 *διαμαρτυρόμενος Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησιν*
τὴν εἰς τὸν Θεὸν μετάνοιαν
καὶ πίστιν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
22 *καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ δεδεμένος τῷ πνεύματι πορεύομαι*
εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ συναντήσοντά μοι

17 *μετεκαλέσατο*] *μετεπέμψατο D* τούς] *πάντας τούς* 𝔏^{g} *παρεγένοντο*] *ἐσκληρύνοντο* (*ex* xix. 9) *E* 18 ὁμῶς (ὁμοῦ *A* : simulque 𝔏^{g}) ὄντων (ἐόν- *D*) αὐτῶν *DA*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.* : ὁμόσε ὄντων αὐτῶν *D corr.*, *Bl.* : ὁμοθυμαδόν *E* : *om. cett.* πρὸς αὐτούς *D* : αὐτοῖς Γ *E* δ ἀδελφοί *D*, 𝔈 : *om. cett.* τῆς πρώτης 614 ἐφ' ἧς *D* ἐπὶ τήν *E* ὡς τριετίαν ἢ καὶ πλεῖον ποταπῶς μεθ' ὑμῶν ἦν (ἤμην *Bl.*) διὰ (per 𝔏^{d} : *om. D*) παντὸς χρόνου *D* : πῶς μεθ' ὑμῶν τὸν πάντα χρόνον ἐγενόμην (ἐγεν. *post* ὑμῶν *hab.* 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.*) *cett. Luc.* 19 καὶ πολλῶν δακρύων *C* δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* ἐν ταῖς ἐπιβουλαῖς] ex (ab) insidiis 𝔏^{dg}, *Luc.* 20 τοῦ *D*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Luc.* : τοῦ μή *cett.* (𝔏^{g}), *Hier.* διδάξαι *D*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Hier. Luc.* : διδάξαι ὑμᾶς *cett.* (𝔏^{g}) κατ' οἰκοὺς καὶ δημοσίᾳ *D* : δημ. καὶ κατ' οἴκους *cett. Hier. Luc.* 21 διαμαρτυρούμενος *D*[1] εἰς τόν *DA* δ : εἰς ℵ *BCE* τὴν πίστιν *E* δ, *Chr.* διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *D* : εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν (*om.* ἡμῶν *E*) Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν (*om.* Χρ. *B*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈, *Luc.*) *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) *Luc.* 22 ἐγώ *ante* δεδεμ. *hab. D* δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, 𝔈 : *post* δεδεμ. *cett.* : *om. Luc.* Ἱεροσόλυμα *D* : Ἱερουσαλήμ Γ *E* δ συναντήσοντα *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : συναντήσαντα *DAE* 383 (*m.* 1) μοι *DAC* δ : ἐμοί ℵ *B* : με *E* (mihi 𝔏^{e}) γινώσκων *D* : εἰδώς Γ *E* δ 23 τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα *D* : τὸ πνεῦμα (+ μοι δ, *Chr.*) τὸ ἅγιον Γ *E* δ κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν

23 *μὴ γινώσκων, πλὴν ὅτι τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα*
κατὰ **πᾶσαν** *πόλιν διαμαρτύρεταί μοι λέγων*
ὅτι δεσμὰ καὶ θλίψεις
μένουσίν μοι **ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις·**
24 *ἀλλ' οὐδενὸς λόγον* **ἔχω μοι**
οὐδὲ *ποιοῦμαι τὴν ψυχήν* **μου** *τιμίαν ἐμαυτῷ,*
τοῦ τελειῶσαι τὸν δρόμον μου
⟨**μετὰ χαρᾶς**⟩,
καὶ τὴν διακονίαν **τοῦ λόγου**
ὃν παρέλαβον παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ,
διαμαρτύρασθαι **Ἰουδαίοις καὶ Ἕλλησιν**
τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ.
25 *καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ οἶδα*
ὅτι οὐκέτι ὄψεσθε τὸ πρόσωπόν μου
ὑμεῖς πάντες,
ἐν οἷς διῆλθον κηρύσσων
τὴν βασιλείαν **τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.**
26 **διότι μαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν**
ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ ὅτι καθαρός εἰμι
ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος πάντων.
27 *οὐ γὰρ ὑπεστειλάμην τοῦ ἀναγγεῖλαι*

D, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, *Luc.* : κατὰ πόλιν Γ δ, 𝔈 : *om. E* διεμαρτύρατο *AE* : διαμεμαρτύρηται 614 μοι *om.* δ, *Chr.* λέγων *DE* δ : λέγον Γ μέν. μοι *D*, 𝔖^{ph}, *Orig.*^{lat} : με μέν. *cett. Luc.* ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις (*ante* με μέν. *vg.*) *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈, *Luc. Ephr.* : *om. cett.* 24 λόγον *DAE* δ, 𝔖^{ph} : λόγου ℵ *BC*, 𝔏^{g} ἔχω μοι (*om.* μοι *A*) οὐδὲ ποιοῦμαι *DA*, 𝔖^{ph} : ποιοῦμαι οὐδὲ ἔχω *E* δ, *Chr.* : ποιοῦμαι *cett.*, *Amb. Luc.* μου *cett. Amb. Aug. Luc.* : *om.* Γ 614, 𝔏^{d} ἐμαυτῷ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : ἐμαυτοῦ *D* τοῦ *D* : ὡς (ὥστε *E* 614) *cett.* τελειώσω ℵ *B* μετὰ χαρᾶς *CE* δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* : *om. cett.* (*D*), *Amb.* τοῦ λόγου ὅν *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, *Amb. Ephr.* : ἣν *cett.* παρέλαβον *D* δ : ἔλαβον Γ *E* Ἰησοῦ *cett. Amb.* : *om.* 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.* Ἰουδαίοις καί Ἕλλησιν *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈, *Luc. Ephr.* : *om. cett.* τοῦ *om. D* 25 ἰδού *om. E*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Luc.* ἐγώ *post* οἶδα *hab. C* ὑμεῖς . . . Ἰησοῦ *om. Iren.* τοῦ Ἰησοῦ *D*, 𝔈 : τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.* : τοῦ θεοῦ *E* δ, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} : *om.* Γ, 𝔖^{ph} 26 διότι (διό *C* δ, *om.* 𝔖^{vg}) μαρτύρομαι . . . ἡμέρᾳ ὅτι *cett. Iren. Hier. Luc.* : ἄχρι οὖν τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας (propter quod hodierno die 𝔏^{d}) *D* εἰμί *cett.* (*vg.*) : ἐγώ *A* 383, *Chr.* : εἰμὶ ἐγώ *Hier.* πάντων] + ὑμῶν *E*, 𝔖, *vg.*^{boh} 27 τοῦ *D* 383, 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.* : τοῦ μή *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) *Iren. Hier.* (et non intermisi praedicando 𝔏^{g} : καὶ οὐ διέλιπον κηρύσσων *Bl.*)

πᾶσαν τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῖν.

28 *προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ,*
ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους,
ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Κυρίου,
ἣν περιεποιήσατο **ἑαυτῷ**
διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου.

29 *ἐγὼ οἶδα ὅτι εἰσελεύσονται*
μετὰ τὴν ἄφιξίν μου λύκοι βαρεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς
μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου·

30 *καὶ ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἀναστήσονται*
ἄνδρες λαλοῦντες διεστραμμένα,
τοῦ ἀποστρέφειν τοὺς μαθητὰς ὀπίσω αὐτῶν.

31 *διὸ γρηγορεῖτε, μνημονεύοντες*
ὅτι τριετίαν νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν
οὐκ ἐπαυσάμην μετὰ δακρύων
νουθετῶν ἕνα ἕκαστον **ὑμῶν.**

32 *καὶ τὰ νῦν παρατίθεμαι ὑμᾶς τῷ Θεῷ*
καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ,
τῷ δυναμένῳ οἰκοδομῆσαι **ὑμᾶς,**
καὶ δοῦναι κληρονομίαν τῶν πάντων
ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις.

33 *ἀργυρίου ἢ χρυσίου ἢ ἱματισμοῦ*
οὐδενὸς **ὑμῶν** *ἐπεθύμησα.*

28 προσέχετε] + οὖν (γοῦν 383) *CE* δ, 𝔖, *Iren.*, *spec.* καὶ ἑαυτοῖς καί *Iren.* τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα *D* : τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον Γ *E* δ (*etiam* 𝔏^{d}) κυρίου (+ Ἰησοῦ *Ambst.*) *cett.* (*c. Th.*), *Iren. Luc. Hier.* : Χριστοῦ 𝔖^{vg} : θεοῦ ℵ *B* δ, *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph} : Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *spec.* ἑαυτῷ *D*, *Iren. Ambst.* : *om. cett. Hier.* 29 ἐγώ] ὅτι ἐγώ *B* : ἐγὼ γάρ *E* δ, 𝔖, 𝔈, *Chr.* οἶδα] + τοῦτο *E* δ, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* 30 καὶ ἐξ *cett.* (𝔏^{g}) : ἐξ *Luc.* ἑαυτῶν ℵ *A*, *om. B* ἀποστρέφειν *D* : ἀποσπᾶν Γ *E* δ ἑαυτῶν ℵ *AB* 31 γρηγορεῖτε . . . ἡμέραν *cett. Luc.* : *om.* 𝔏^{g} καί] δέ *D*^{1} ὑμῶν *cett. Luc. Hier.* : *om.* Γ 32 νῦν] + μέν 𝔏^{g} ὑμᾶς] + ἀδελφοί (*post* θεῷ δ) *CE* δ, *vg.*^{w}, *Chr.* τῷ κυρίῳ *B*, 𝔏^{g} ἐποικοδομῆσαι δ, *Chr.* ὑμᾶς *DE*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : *om. cett.* δοῦναι] + ὑμῖν *C* δ, 𝔖, 𝔈, *Hier.* κληρον. *D* δ, *Chr.* : τὴν κληρον. Γ *E* τῶν πάντων ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις *scripsi* : ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις τῶν πάντων *D* : ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πᾶσιν *cett.* (*post* πᾶσιν *add.* αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (+ τῶν αἰώνων 383). ἀμήν δ, 𝔖^{ph}) 33 ἢ χρυσίου] καὶ χρυσίου *D*, *spec.* ὑμῶν *DE*, *spec.* : *om. cett. Aug.* 34 γιγνώσκετε] οἴδατε *A* τὰς

34 *αὐτοὶ γινώσκετε ὅτι ταῖς χρείαις μου*
καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ
ὑπηρέτησαν αἱ χεῖρές μου.
35 *πᾶσιν ὑπέδειξα ὑμῖν ὅτι οὕτως κοπιῶντας*
δεῖ ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῶν ἀσθενούντων,
μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ,
ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν· Μακάριόν ἐστιν
μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν.
36 *καὶ ταῦτα εἴπας θεὶς τὰ γόνατα*
σὺν πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς προσηύξατο.
37 *ἱκανὸς δὲ κλαυθμὸς ἐγένετο πάντων,*
καὶ ἐπιπεσόντες ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τοῦ Παύλου
κατεφίλουν αὐτόν,
38 *μάλιστα ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ ὀδυνώμενοι*
ὅτι εἶπεν· Οὐκέτι μέλλετε
τὸ πρόσωπον θεωρεῖν.
προέπεμπον δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ πλοῖον.

XXI

1 *καὶ ἐπιβάντες ἀνήχθημεν·*
ἀποσπασθέντων δὲ ἡμῶν ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν
εὐθυδρομήσαντες ἤκομεν εἰς Κῶ,
τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ εἰς Ῥόδον,

χρείας *D* καὶ πᾶσιν *Born.* : πᾶσιν καί *D* (*cf.* i. 5, xx. 9) : πάσαις $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Bl.* : καί *cett. Ambst. Aug.*, *spec.* μοῦ *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}^{vg}$: αὗται *cett.* ($\mathfrak{E}^{vt}$), *Ambst. Aug.*, *spec.* 35 πᾶσιν *D*, *spec.* $\frac{2}{2}$: πάντα (καὶ π. *C*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$) *cett. Aug.* τε *om. D* τὸν λόγον 383, *vg.*, *Chr.* οὗτος *D* μακάριος *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *cf. const. Ap.* iv. 3 μακάριον εἶπεν εἶναι τὸν διδόντα ὑπὲρ τὸν λαμβάνοντα 36 εἴπας *D* : εἰπών Γ *E* δ γόνατα *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: + αὐτοῦ *cett.* 37 ἐγένετο δὲ κλαυθμὸς ἱκανός δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Chr.* 38 ὀδυνώμ. *hoc loco hab. D*, *ante* μάλιστα Γ *E* δ ὅτι εἶπεν *D* : ᾧ εἰρήκει Γ *E* δ οὐκέτι *D* : ὅτι οὐκέτι *cett.* μέλλετε *D*[1] (*sec. Blass*), $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: μέλλουσιν *cett.* (*D*[2]) πρόσωπον *D* : + μου $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: + αὐτοῦ *cett.* ἐπί *D* : εἰς Γ *E* δ XXI 1 καὶ ἐπιβάντες ἀνήχθημεν *D* : ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο ἀναχθῆναι (-θέντας ℵ) ἡμᾶς *cett. Cass.* : *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ ἀποσπασθέντων δὲ ἡμῶν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ἀποσπασθέντας (-τες *B*) *cett.* (ἐπιβάντες ἀνήχθημεν *post* ἀποσπασθέντων δὲ ἡμῶν ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν *transp. Bl.*) ἤκομεν *D* : ἤλθομεν Γ *E* δ Κῶ *D* : τὴν Κῶ Γ *E* δ ἐπιούσῃ *D* : ἑξῆς Γ *E* δ Ῥόδον *DC* : τὴν Ῥόδον ℵ *ABE* δ

κἀκεῖθεν εἰς Πάταρα **καὶ Μύρα.**
2 καὶ εὑρόντες πλοῖον
διαπερῶν εἰς Φοινίκην
ἐπιβάντες ἀνήχθημεν.
3 ἀναφάναντες δὲ τὴν Κύπρον
καὶ καταλιπόντες αὐτὴν εὐώνυμον
ἐπλέομεν εἰς Συρίαν
καὶ κατήχθημεν εἰς Τύρον·
ἐκεῖσε γὰρ ἦν τὸ πλοῖον
ἀποφορτιζόμενον τὸν γόμον.
4 καὶ ἀνευρόντες τοὺς μαθητὰς
ἐπεμείναμεν αὐτοῦ ἡμέρας ἑπτά·
τινὲς δὲ τῷ Παύλῳ ἔλεγον διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος
μὴ ἀναβαίνειν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα·
5 *ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο ἐξαρτίσαι ἡμᾶς τὰς ἡμέρας,*
ἐξελθόντες ἐπορευόμεθα **τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν,**
προπεμπόντων ἡμᾶς πάντων
σὺν γυναιξὶν καὶ τέκνοις
ἕως ἔξω τῆς πόλεως· καὶ θέντες τὰ γόνατα
ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν προσηυξάμεθα.
6 καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι ἀλλήλους
ἀνέβημεν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον,
ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς τὰ ἴδια.
7 ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸν πλοῦν διανύσαντες

1 καὶ Μύρα *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{w}, 𝔈 : *om. cett. Cass.* 3 ἀναφάναντες ℵ *B*^{1} 383 (*m.* 2): ἀναφανέντες *AB*^{2}*CE* δ (383 *m.* 1) ἐπλέομεν] collauimus (*sic*) 𝔏^{d} κατήχθημεν *C* δ, *Chr.*: κατήλθομεν ℵ *ABE* ἦν τὸ πλοῖον 383, 𝔏^{d}, 𝔖 (habebat navis exponere onus 𝔏^{g}) 4 καὶ ἀνευρ. δ, 𝔏^{dg}, 𝔖 : ἀνευρ. δέ *cett.* αὐτοῦ] ἐν (*om. E*) αὐτοῖς *AE*, 𝔏^{de}, 𝔖, 𝔈 τινὲς δέ 𝔏^{d} : οἵτινες *cett.* ἀναβαίνειν *E* δ, *Chr.* : ἐπιβαίνειν Γ (ingredi 𝔏^{d}) 5 ὅτε δὲ ἐγέν. ἐξαρτίσαι ἡμᾶς (ἡμᾶς ἐξαρτ. ℵ *C* δ) τὰς ἡμέρας *cett.* : et expletis diebus 𝔏^{g} *vg.* : et post illos dies 𝔖^{vg} : sequenti autem die 𝔏^{d} (*cf. v.* 8) τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν 𝔏^{d}, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.* πάντων ἡμᾶς 𝔏^{d} ἕως *om.* ℵ, 𝔏^{dgp1} προσηυξάμεθα δ, 𝔏^{deg} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈 : προσευξάμενοι Γ *E* 6 καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι ἀλλήλους δ, 𝔏^{deg} *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈 : ἀπησπασάμεθα ἀλλ. καί Γ *E* ἀνέβημεν ℵ *AC* 614 : ἐνέβημεν *BE* : ἐπέβημεν 383 (ἀνέβημεν . . . πλοῖον *om.* 𝔏^{d} *suo loco, signis* α, β, γ *add.*) ἐκεῖνοι . . . ἴδια] reversi vero quisque ad sua 𝔏^{d} 7 κατηντήσαμεν ℵ *BC* δ : κατέβημεν *AE* παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς ἡμέραν μίαν 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}

ἀπὸ Τύρου κατηντήσαμεν εἰς Πτολεμαΐδα,
καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς
ἐμείναμεν ἡμέραν μίαν παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς. 8 *τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον*
ἐξελθόντες ἤλθομεν εἰς Καισάρειαν, καὶ εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν
οἶκον Φιλίππου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ, ὄντος ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά, ἐμείναμεν
παρ᾽ αὐτῷ. 9 *τούτῳ δὲ ἦσαν θυγατέρες παρθένοι τέσσαρες*
προφητεύουσαι. 10 *ἐπιμενόντων δὲ* **ἡμῶν** *ἡμέρας πλείους,*
κατῆλθέν τις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας
προφήτης ὀνόματι Ἄγαβος,
11 *ἀνελθὼν δὲ πρὸς ἡμᾶς*
καὶ ἄρας τὴν ζώνην τοῦ Παύλου
δήσας ἑαυτοῦ τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας εἶπεν·
Τάδε λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον·
Τὸν ἄνδρα οὗ ἐστιν ἡ ζώνη αὕτη
οὕτως δήσουσιν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι
καὶ παραδώσουσιν εἰς χεῖρας ἐθνῶν.
12 *ὡς δὲ ἠκούσαμεν ταῦτα,*
παρεκαλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς
καὶ οἱ ἐντόπιοι **τὸν Παῦλον**
τοῦ μὴ ἀναβαίνειν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ.
13 **εἶπεν** *δὲ* **πρὸς ἡμᾶς** *ὁ Παῦλος·*
Τί ποιεῖτε κλαίοντες
καὶ θορυβοῦντές μου τὴν καρδίαν;
ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐ μόνον δεθῆναι **βούλομαι**

9 τούτῳ δέ] ᾧ 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg} παρθένοι τέσσαρες *E* δ : τέσσ. παρθένοι ℵ *AB* : πέντε παρθένοι *Anon*^{c}. 10 ἡμῶν *c.Th. E* δ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔈 : αὐτῶν ℵ : *om. ABC*, 𝔖^{ph} (+ἐν Καισαρείᾳ 𝔏^{g} : +ἐκεῖ *vg.*^{a}) 11 ἀνελθὼν δέ (cum venisset 𝔏^{d}) *D*^{1} : καὶ ἐλθών *cett.* (*D corr.*) τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας *A* δ, 𝔈, *Chr.* εἰς (*om.* 𝔏^{d}) *D* : ἐν *cett.* οἱ *om. D* (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι *ante* ἐν Ἱερ. *hab.* 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Amb.*) παραδώσουσιν] +αὐτόν *vg.*^{aq}, 𝔖, 𝔈 12 ὡς . . . ταῦτα] his auditis 𝔏^{g} παρεκαλοῦμεν *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : παρακ. *D* ἡμεῖς *D* : ἡμεῖς τε Γ *E* δ τὸν Παῦλον *D*, 𝔏^{g} : αὐτόν 𝔈 : *om. cett.* ἐπιβαίνειν *D* 13 εἶπεν (respondit 𝔏^{d}) δὲ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ Π. *D* : τότε ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Π. καὶ εἶπεν (*om.* καὶ εἶπεν *B*) ℵ *ABE*, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Cass.* : ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ὁ Π. *C* δ, 𝔖^{ph} : ὃς ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν ἡμῖν 𝔏^{g} κλαίοντες καί *cett. Tert. Orig.* : *om.* ℵ, *Aug.* θορυβοῦντες *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *Tert. Aug. Hier.* : συνθρύπτοντες *cett. Orig.* ἐγὼ γάρ *cett.* (𝔏^{e}) *Tert.* ½ : ἐγὼ δέ *E*, *Tert.* ½ βούλομαι *D*, *Tert.* : *om. cett. Orig. Aug. Hier.*

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποθανεῖν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ
ἑτοίμως ἔχω ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ **Χριστοῦ.**
14 *μὴ πειθομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ,*
ἡσυχάσαμεν εἰπόντες **πρὸς ἀλλήλους·**
Τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ γινέσθω.
15 *μετὰ δέ τινας ἡμέρας ἀποταξάμενοι*
ἀνεβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα·
16 **συνῆλθον δὲ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν**
ἐκ Καισαρείας σὺν ἡμῖν·
οὗτοι δὲ ἤγαγον ἡμᾶς
πρὸς οὓς ξενισθῶμεν,
καὶ παραγενόμενοι εἴς τινα κώμην
ἐγενόμεθα παρὰ *Μνάσωνί τινι Κυπρίῳ,*
17 *μαθητῇ ἀρχαίῳ.* **κἀκεῖθεν ἐξιόντες**
ἤλθομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα,
ὑπεδέξαντό τε ἡμᾶς ἀσμένως οἱ ἀδελφοί.
18 *τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ εἰσῄει ὁ Παῦλος*
σὺν ἡμῖν πρὸς Ἰάκωβον·
ἦσαν δὲ παρ᾽ αὐτῷ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι **συνηγμένοι·**
19 *οὓς ἀσπασάμενος διηγεῖτο καθ᾽ ἓν ἕκαστον*

13 εἰς Ἱερ. *post* δεθῆναι *hab. Tert.* $\frac{1}{2}$, *om.* 383, *Aug.* ἑτοίμως ἔχω *ante* εἰς Ἱερ. *hab. A, Ambst.*; *post* Ἰησοῦ 614, 𝔖$^{\mathrm{ph}}$; *post* δεθῆναι 𝔖$^{\mathrm{vg}}$: *om. Tert.* $\frac{2}{2}$ Χριστοῦ *DC*, 𝔏$^{\mathrm{g}}$, 𝔖$^{\mathrm{vg}}$, *Tert.* $\frac{2}{2}$, *Ambst.*: *om. cett.* 14 ἡσυχάμενοι *D* πρὸς ἀλλήλους *D*: *om. cett. Tert.* τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ (κυρίου δ, 𝔏$^{\mathrm{dg}}$, 𝔖, *Tert.*) *D* δ, 𝔏$^{\mathrm{dg}}$, 𝔖, *Polycarp. apud Eus.* (*H. E.* iv. 15, 12), *Tert.*: τοῦ κυρίου τὸ θέλημα Γ *E*, *vg.* 15 τινὰς ἡμέρας *D*: τὰς ἡμ. ταύτας *cett.* (𝔏$^{\mathrm{d}}$) ἀποταξάμενοι *D*: refecimus nos 𝔏$^{\mathrm{dg}}$: ἐπισκευασάμενοι (παρασκ. *C*) *cett.* ἀναβαίνομεν *DC* 383 (*m.* 1), *Chr.* 16 συνῆλθον δὲ καὶ (+τινες 𝔏$^{\mathrm{g}}$ *vg.*$^{\mathrm{a}}$) τῶν (ἐκ τῶν *E*) μαθητῶν *cett.*: *om. D* ἐκ Καισ. *D*: ἀπὸ Καισ. Γ *E* δ οὗτοι δὲ (simulque 𝔏$^{\mathrm{d}}$) ἤγαγον ἡμᾶς *D*: ἄγοντες *cett.* πρὸς οὓς *D*^{1} (*sec. Wetstein*): παρ᾽ ᾧ *cett.* (*D*^{2}) καὶ παραγενόμενοι (cum venerunt 𝔏$^{\mathrm{d}}$) . . . ἐγενόμεθα παρά *D c.Th.*: *om. cett.* Μνάσωνι] Νάσωνι *D*: Μνάσῳ *B*: Ἰάσονι ℵ, 𝔏$^{\mathrm{g}}$ *vg.*$^{\mathrm{aw}}$ μαθητῇ ἀρχαίῳ *D*: ἀρχαίῳ μαθητῇ Γ *E* δ (ex discipulis primis 𝔖$^{\mathrm{ph}}$) 17 κἀκεῖθεν ἐξιόντες ἤλθομεν *D c.Th.*: γενομένων δὲ ἡμῶν *cett.* ὑπεδέξαντό τε (δέ 𝔏$^{\mathrm{d}}$) . . . ἀδελφοί *D*, 𝔏$^{\mathrm{g}}$: ἀσμένως ἀπεδέξαντο (ἐδέξ. δ) ἡμᾶς οἱ ἀδ. *cett. Hier.* 18 τῇ τε ℵ *AE*, 𝔏$^{\mathrm{g}}$ εἰσῄει ὁ Π. σὺν ἡμῖν] intravimus cum Paulo 𝔏$^{\mathrm{g}}$, 𝔖$^{\mathrm{vg}}$ ἦσαν δὲ παρ᾽ αὐτῷ (+πάντες 𝔖$^{\mathrm{vg}}$): πάντες τε παρεγένοντο (+παρ᾽ αὐτῷ 𝔖$^{\mathrm{ph}}$) *cett.* συνηγμένοι *D*: *om. cett.* 19 οὓς ἀσπασάμενος (-οι 𝔏$^{\mathrm{g}}$) *D*, 𝔏$^{\mathrm{g}}$ *vg.*: καὶ ἀσπασά-

ὧν ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν
διὰ τῆς διακονίας αὐτοῦ.
20 οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐδόξασαν τὸν Κύριον εἰπόντες·
Θεωρεῖς, ἀδελφέ, πόσαι μυριάδες εἰσὶν
ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ τῶν πεπιστευκότων,
καὶ πάντες **οὗτοι** ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου ὑπάρχουσιν·
21 κατηχήθησαν δὲ περὶ σοῦ
ὅτι ἀποστασίαν διδάσκεις ἀπὸ Μωσέως
τοὺς κατὰ τὰ ἔθνη Ἰουδαίους *λέγων*
μὴ περιτέμνειν αὐτοὺς τὰ τέκνα
μήτε ἐν τοῖς ἔθεσιν **αὐτοῦ** περιπατεῖν.
22 τί οὖν ἐστίν; πάντως
δεῖ πλῆθος συνελθεῖν·
ἀκούσονται γὰρ ὅτι ἐλήλυθας.
23 τοῦτο οὖν ποίησον ὅ σοι λέγομεν.
εἰσὶν ἡμῖν ἄνδρες τέσσαρες
εὐχὴν ἔχοντες ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν·
24 τούτους παραλαβὼν ἁγνίσθητι σὺν αὐτοῖς
καὶ δαπάνησον εἰς αὐτούς,
ἵνα ξυρῶνται τὴν κεφαλήν,

μενος (-οι $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$) αὐτούς *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) διηγεῖτο *D*: ἐξηγεῖτο Γ *E* δ (+Παῦλος $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, +αὐτοῖς $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, +αὐτοῖς Παῦλος $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$) καθ' ἕν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$): ἕνα *D* ὧν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$): ὡς *D* ἐν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$): *om. D* 20 ἐδόξασαν *D* ℵ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: ἐδόξαζον *cett.* κύριον *D* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: θεόν *cett.* εἰπόντες *D*: εἰπόντες αὐτῷ *C* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: εἶπόν τε αὐτῷ *cett.* ἀδελφέ *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Aug. Hier.*: Ἰουδαίων δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις *cett. Ambst.*, *spec.*: *om.* ℵ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ πεπιστευκότων] +εἰς τὸν Χριστόν *Aug. Hier.* οὗτοι *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Ambst. Aug. Hier.*: *om. cett.* 21 κατήκησαν (*sic*) D^{1} (diffamaverunt $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$) κατὰ τὰ ἔθνη] κατὰ ἔθνη εἰσιν *D* Ἰουδαίους (-οις *D*) *DAE* 383, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, *Aug. Hier.*: πάντας Ἰουδ. *cett.* λέγων *om. D* μή] +ὀφείλειν *E*, *vg.*, *Aug. Hier.* τέκνα] +αὐτῶν $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, *Aug. Hier.* μήτε *D*: μηδέ Γ *E* δ ἐν *D*: *om.* Γ *E* δ ἔθνεσιν *D* δ αὐτοῦ *D c. Th.*: τοῦ νόμου $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.* 22 τί οὖν . . . πάντως *om.* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ δεῖ πλῆθος συνελθεῖν *D* 383: δεῖ συν. πλῆθος ℵ *AE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, *Aug. Hier.*: *om. BC* 614, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$ γὰρ ὅτι *DAE* 383, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Aug. Hier.*: ὅτι *BC* 614, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: *om.* ℵ ἐλήλυθας] +huc $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ 23 τοῦτο οὖν] nunc ergo $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ ὅ] ὅπερ *E* ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν ℵ *B*, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Orig.* 24 εἰς αὐτούς *D*, *Aug.*: ἐπ' αὐτοῖς (-ούς *A*) Γ *E*: σὺν αὐτοῖς δ ξυρῶνται *D*: ξυρήσονται ℵ *BE* 614: ξυρήσωνται *AC* 383

καὶ γνώσονται πάντες ὅτι ὧν κατήχηνται
περὶ σοῦ οὐδέν ἐστιν,
ἀλλ' ὅτι πορεύῃ καὶ αὐτὸς φυλάσσων τὸν νόμον.
25 *περὶ δὲ τῶν πεπιστευκότων ἐθνῶν*
οὐδὲν ἔχουσιν λέγειν πρὸς σέ,
ἡμεῖς **γὰρ** *ἀπεστείλαμεν κρίναντες*
μηδὲν τοιοῦτον τηρεῖν αὐτοὺς
εἰ μὴ *φυλάσσεσθαι αὐτοὺς τὸ εἰδωλόθυτον*
καὶ αἷμα καὶ πορνείαν.
26 *τότε* Παῦλος *παραλαβὼν τοὺς ἄνδρας*
τῇ ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ σὺν αὐτοῖς
ἁγνισθεὶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν,
διαγγέλλων τὴν ἐκπλήρωσιν τῶν ἡμερῶν
τοῦ ἁγνισμοῦ, ὅπως προσενεχθῇ
ὑπὲρ ἑνὸς ἑκάστου αὐτῶν ἡ προσφορά.
27 *συντελουμένης δὲ τῆς ἑβδόμης ἡμέρας,*
οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἰουδαῖοι **ἐληλυθότες**
θεασάμενοι αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ιερῷ
συνέχεον πάντα τὸν ὄχλον
28 *καὶ ἐπιβάλλουσιν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας κράζοντες·*
Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται, *βοηθεῖτε·*
οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ κατὰ τοῦ λαοῦ
καὶ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τοῦ τόπου τούτου
πάντας πανταχῇ διδάσκων·

24 γνῶσι δ, 𝔏^{dg}, *Chr.* ἀλλ' ὅτι *D*, 𝔈 : ἀλλά *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Aug. Hier.* πορεύῃ (-ου) *D* : στοιχεῖς Γ *E* δ καί *om. D* 25 *Versum om. Hier. Ep.* 112, 10 ἐθνῶν] ἀνθρώπων *E* οὐδὲν . . . πρὸς σέ *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈 : *om. cett.* γάρ *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈 : *om. cett. Aug.* ἀπεστείλαμεν *DB* 614 : ἐπεστ. ℵ *ACE* 383 κρίνοντες *D* μηδὲν . . . εἰ μή *DCE* δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Aug.* : *om.* ℵ *AB*, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 τὸ εἰδωλόθυτον *D* 614 : τό τε εἰδωλόθυτον Γ 383 : ἀπὸ εἰδωλοθύτων (-του) *E*, *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈, *Aug.* αἷμα *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *Aug.* : αἷμα καὶ πνικτόν Γ δ : αἵματος καὶ πνικτοῦ (-τῶν 𝔈) *E*, *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈 : πνικτοῦ καὶ αἵματος 𝔖^{vg} 26 Παῦλος *DE* : ὁ Παῦλος Γ δ ἐπιούσῃ *D* : ἐχομένῃ Γ *E* δ εἰσῆλθεν *D* : εἰσῄει Γ *E* δ ὅπως *D* : ἕως οὗ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Cass.* προσενέχθῃ 𝔏^{eg} *vg.*, 𝔖, *Cass.* (*coni. Lachmann*) : προσηνέχθη *cett.* (*D*) ἡ *om. D* 27 συντελουμένης δὲ (+ eis 𝔏^{d}) τῆς ἑβδόμης ἡμέρας *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : ὡς δὲ ἔμελλον αἱ ἑπτὰ ἡμέραι συντελεῖσθαι (τελειοῦσθαι δ) *cett.* οἱ *cett.* (𝔏^{d}) : οἱ

ἔτι τε καὶ Ἕλληνας εἰσῆγεν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν
καὶ κεκοίνωκεν τὸν ἅγιον τόπον τοῦτον.
29 *ἦσαν γὰρ προεωρακότες*
Τρόφιμον τὸν Ἐφέσιον ἐν τῇ πόλει σὺν αὐτῷ,
ὃν ἐνόμισαν ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν εἰσήγαγεν Παῦλος.
30 *ἐκινήθη τε ἡ πόλις ὅλη,*
καὶ ἐγένετο συνδρομὴ τοῦ λαοῦ,
καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενοι τοῦ Παύλου
εἷλκον ἔξω τοῦ ἱεροῦ,
καὶ εὐθέως ἐκλείσθησαν αἱ θύραι.
31 *καὶ ζητούντων αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι*
ἀνέβη φάσις τῷ χιλιάρχῳ τῆς σπείρης
ὅτι Ὅλη συγχύνεται Ἱερουσαλήμ·
⟨**ὅρα οὖν μὴ ποιῶνται ἐπανάστασιν.**⟩
32 *ὃς ἐξαυτῆς παραλαβὼν στρατιώτας*
καὶ ἑκατοντάρχας κατέδραμεν ἐπ' αὐτούς.
οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες τὸν χιλίαρχον καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτας
ἐπαύσαντο τύπτοντες τὸν Παῦλον.
33 *τότε ἐγγίσας ὁ χιλίαρχος*
ἐπελάβετο αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐκέλευσεν δεθῆναι ἁλύσεσιν δυσίν,
καὶ ἐπυνθάνετο τίς εἴη καὶ τί ἐστιν πεποιηκώς·
34 *ἄλλοι δὲ ἄλλα ἐπεφώνουν ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ·*
καὶ μὴ δυναμένου αὐτοῦ γνῶναι τὸ ἀσφαλὲς

δέ *D* ἐληλυθότες *D* : *om. cett.* θεασάμενοι αὐτόν *ante* οἱ ἀπό *hab.* δ συνεκίνησάν τε τὸν ὄχλον *E* ἐπιβάλλουσιν *D* : ἐπέβαλον *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) 28 κράζοντες] + καὶ λέγοντες $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}^{vt}$ βοηθήσατε *E* τοῦ λαοῦ καί *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ ἔτι τε] ἔτι *D* εἰσῆγεν *D* : εἰσήγαγεν Γ *E* δ εἰς τό] εἰς *D* κεκοίνωκεν Γ 383 : κεκοινώνηκεν *E* 614 : ἐκοινώνησεν *D* 29 ἐνόμισαν $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$: ἐνομίσαμεν *D* : ἐνόμιζον Γ *E* δ Παῦλος *D* : ὁ Παῦλος Γ *E* δ 30 εἷλκον *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: + αὐτόν *cett.* καὶ εὐθέως . . . θύραι *om.* $\mathfrak{E}^{vt}$ 31 καὶ ζητούντων *D* : ζητούντων τε (δέ δ, *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$) *cett.* συγκέχυται *E* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ Ἱερουσαλήμ] πόλις $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ ὅρα οὖν . . . ἐπανάστασιν $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: *om. cett.* (*D*) 32 ἑκατοντάρχην $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ 33 τότε] καί $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ ἂν εἴη *E* δ 34 ἄλλα *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Chr.* : ἄλλο τι (aliud $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$) *cett.* καὶ μὴ δυναμένου αὐτοῦ *D* : μὴ δυναμένου δὲ αὐτοῦ Γ *E* : μὴ δυνάμενος δέ δ, *Chr.*

διὰ τὸν θόρυβον,
ἐκέλευσεν ἄγεσθαι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν.
35 ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο εἰς τοὺς ἀναβαθμούς,
συνέβη τὸν Παῦλον
βαστάζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν
διὰ τὴν βίαν τοῦ λαοῦ·
36 ἠκολούθει γὰρ τὸ πλῆθος
κρᾶζον ἀναιρεῖσθαι αὐτόν.
37 μέλλων τε εἰσάγεσθαι εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν
τῷ χιλιάρχῳ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν·
Εἰ ἔξεστίν μοι λαλῆσαι πρός σε;
ὁ δὲ ἔφη· Ἑλληνιστὶ γινώσκεις;
38 οὐκ *ἄρα* σὺ εἶ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος
ὁ πρὸ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀναστατώσας
καὶ ἐξαγαγὼν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον
τοὺς τετρακισχιλίους ἄνδρας τῶν σικαρίων;
39 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Παῦλος·
Ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος μέν εἰμι Ἰουδαῖος,
ἐν Ταρσῷ δὲ τῆς Κιλικίας γεγεννημένος,
οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως πολίτης·
δέομαι δέ σου συγχωρῆσαί μοι
λαλῆσαι πρὸς τὸν λαόν.
40 καὶ ἐπιτρέψαντος τοῦ χιλιάρχου

35 εἰς *D*: ἐπί Γ *E* δ τὸν Παῦλον βαστ. *D*: βαστ. αὐτόν *cett.* λαοῦ *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}: ὄχλου *cett.* 36 τὸ πλῆθος *D*, 𝔏^{g}: populus *c. Th.*: τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ (ὄχλου δ) *cett.* κρᾶζον *D* δ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}: κράζοντες Γ *E*, 𝔖^{vg} ἀναιρεῖσθαι *D*: αἶρε (tollite 𝔏^{d}) *cett.* αὐτόν] τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἡμῶν 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈: + ἀπὸ τῶν ζώντων δ (ἆρον αὐτόν· τουτέστιν ἐκ τῶν ζώντων *Chr.*), *cf.* xxiv. 18 37 τῷ χιλιάρχῳ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν *D*: ὁ Παῦλος λέγει τῷ χιλιάρχῳ *cett.* λαλῆσαι *D*: εἰπεῖν τι *cett.* 38 οὐκ ἄρα *cett. Eus.*: οὐ *D*, 𝔖 ἐξαναστατώσας *E* 39 εἶπεν δέ] + πρὸς αὐτόν 𝔏^{g} *vg.* ἐν Ταρσῷ δὲ τῆς Κιλικ. γεγεννημένος *D*, *vg.*^{qw}, 𝔖^{vg} (*fere*): Ταρσεὺς (a Tarso *vg.*) τῆς Κιλικ. *cett.* οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως πολίτης *cett.* (𝔏^{d}): *om.* *D* συγχωρῆσαι *D*: ἐπίτρεψον Γ *E* δ 40 καὶ ἐπιτρέψαντος (+ δέ *D*, + αὐτῷ 𝔏^{dg}) *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}: ἐπιτρέψαντος δέ *cett.* τοῦ χιλιάρχου *D*, 𝔈: αὐτοῦ *cett.* ἑστὼς ὁ Π. *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}: ὁ Π. ἑστώς *cett.* καὶ σείσας (et movit 𝔏^{d}) *D* πρὸς αὐτούς *D*, 𝔖^{vg}: τῷ λαῷ *cett.* τε *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*: δέ *cett.* ἡσυχίας *D*: σιγῆς Γ *E* δ

ἑστὼς ὁ Παῦλος ἐπὶ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν
κατέσεισεν τῇ χειρὶ πρὸς αὐτούς·
πολλῆς τε ἡσυχίας γενομένης,
προσεφώνησεν τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ λέγων·

XXII

1 *Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, ἀκούσατέ μου*
τῆς πρὸς ὑμᾶς νυνὶ ἀπολογίας.
2 *ἀκούσαντες δὲ ὅτι τῇ Ἑβραΐδι*
διαλέκτῳ προσφωνεῖ,
μᾶλλον ἡσύχασαν, καί φησιν·
3 *Ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰουδαῖος ἀνήρ,*
ἐν Ταρσῷ τῆς Κιλικίας γεγεννημένος,
ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ
παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γαμαλιήλ,
παιδευόμενος κατὰ ἀκρίβειαν
τοῦ πατρῴου νόμου, ζηλωτὴς τοῦ Θεοῦ
καθὼς ἐστὲ ὑμεῖς πάντες σήμερον,
4 *καὶ ταύτην τὴν ὁδὸν ἐδίωξα μέχρι θανάτου,*
δεσμεύων καὶ παραδιδοὺς εἰς φυλακὴν
ἄνδρας τε καὶ γυναῖκας·
5 *ὡς καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς μαρτυρήσει μοι*
καὶ ὅλον τὸ πρεσβυτέριον·

προσεφ.] + αὐτούς $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ λέγων *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ XXII 1 νυνί *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ 2 προσφωνεῖ *DE* (+ αὐτοῖς *E*), $\mathfrak{L}^{p1}$: προσεφώνει αὐτοῖς (*om.* αὐτοῖς $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{e}$) ἡσύχασαν *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: παρέσχον ἡσυχίαν *cett.* 3 εἰμι Ἰουδαῖος ἀνήρ *D*: ἀνήρ εἰμι Ἰουδ. ℵ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: εἰμι (+ μέν δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$) ἀνὴρ Ἰουδ. *cett.* γεγεννημένος *post* Κιλικ. *hab. D*, *ante* ἐν Ταρσῷ *cett.* Γαμαλιήλου *B* 614 παιδευόμενος *D*: πεπαιδευμένος *cett.* ζηλωτής *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.* : + ὑπάρχων *cett.* τοῦ θεοῦ *om.* 614, *Chr.* $\frac{1}{3}$, *del. Bl.* : τοῦ νόμου *vg.* : τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Chr.* $\frac{1}{3}$ (*cf. Gal.* i. 14) ἐστὲ ὑμεῖς πάντες *D* : ὑμεῖς πάντες ἐστέ $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}$: πάντες ὑμεῖς ἐστέ *cett.* 4 καί *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ὅς *cett.* (*om.* $\mathfrak{E}$) τὴν ὁδόν *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ μέχρι *D* 383 : ἄχρι Γ *E* 614 φυλακήν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}$: φυλακάς *cett.* 5 ὁ *om. D* ἀρχιερεύς] + Ἀνανίας δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ μαρτυρήσει *D* : ἐμαρτύρει *B* : μαρτυρεῖ (ἐπιμαρτ. δ) *cett.* καὶ ὅλον (*ita D*, πᾶν Γ *E* δ) τὸ πρεσβυτέριον] καὶ πάντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον καὶ πάντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

παρ' ὧν καὶ ἐπιστολὰς δεξάμενος πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς
εἰς Δαμασκὸν ἐπορευόμην
ἄξων καὶ τοὺς ἐκεῖ ὄντας
δεδεμένους εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ,
ἵνα τιμωρηθῶσιν.
6 ἐγγίζοντι δέ μοι μεσημβρίας Δαμασκῷ
ἐξαίφνης ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
περιήστραψέν με φῶς ἱκανόν,
7 καὶ ἔπεσον εἰς τὸ ἔδαφος
καὶ ἤκουσα φωνῆς λεγούσης μοι·
Σαούλ, Σαούλ, τί με διώκεις;
⟨**σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν.**⟩
8 ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπεκρίθην· Τίς εἶ, Κύριε;
εἶπεν δὲ πρός με· Ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος
ὃν σὺ διώκεις.
9 οἱ δὲ σὺν ἐμοὶ ὄντες τὸ μὲν φῶς ἐθεάσαντο
καὶ ἔμφοβοι ἐγένοντο,
τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν τοῦ λαλοῦντός μοι.
10 εἶπα δέ· Τί ποιήσω, Κύριε;
ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρός με· Ἀναστὰς πορεύου εἰς Δαμασκόν,
κἀκεῖ σοι λαληθήσεται περὶ πάντων
ὧν τέτακταί σοι ποιῆσαι.
11 ὡς δὲ **ἀνέστην**, οὐκ ἐνέβλεπον
ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ φωτὸς ἐκείνου,

5 *καί* (*ante* ἐπιστ.) *om.* *D* πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς] παρὰ (*fort.* κατά) τῶν ἀδελφῶν *D*: *om.* 𝔈 ἄξαι *E* ἐκεῖ *D*: ἐκεῖσε Γ *E* δ εἰς] ἐν *D* τιμωρηθῶσιν] + si qui de hac via essent 𝔏^{g} 6 ἐγγίζοντι δέ . . . Δαμασκῷ *D*: ἐγένετο δέ μοι πορευομένῳ καὶ ἐγγίζοντι τῇ Δαμ. περὶ μεσημβρίαν *cett.* ἀπό *D*: ἐκ Γ *E* δ περιήστραψέν με 𝔏^{g}, *Athan.* (*serm. mai. de fide* 26): περιεστραψαμ D^{1}: περιήστραψεν *E* 614: περιαστράψαι Γ 383 ἱκανόν 𝔏^{g}, *Athan. Bl.*: + περὶ ἐμέ *cett.* (*D*) 7 καὶ ἔπεσον (-σα *Athan.*) *D*, *Athan.*: ἔπεσά (-σον δ) τε Γ *E* δ φωνῆς *cett. Athan.*: + διαλέκτῳ Ἑβραΐδι *c.Th.*, 𝔏^{g} (*cf.* xxvi. 14) Σαούλ, Σαούλ Γ *E* δ, *Athan.*: Σαῦλε, Σαῦλε *D* σκληρόν . . . λακτίζειν *c.Th.* *E*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Athan.*: *om. cett.* (*D*) 8 ἀπεκρίθην] + καὶ εἶπα ℵ, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈^{vt} (κἀγὼ εἶπον *Athan.*) εἶπεν δέ *D*: εἶπέν τε *cett.*: καὶ ὁ κύριός φησιν *Athan.* με *DE* δ, *Athan.*: ἐμέ Γ ὁ Ναζωραῖος *om.* *Athan.* 9 καὶ ἔμφοβοι ἐγένοντο *DE* δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈: *om.* Γ, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} 10 εἶπα *D*: εἶπον Γ *E* δ ὁ δέ *D*, 𝔈: + κύριος *cett.* ἀνάστα 𝔏^{g}

καὶ χειραγωγούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν συνόντων μοι
ἦλθον εἰς Δαμασκόν.
12 *Ἀνανίας δέ τις, ἀνὴρ εὐλαβὴς*
κατὰ τὸν νόμον, μαρτυρούμενος
*ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν *κατοικούντων* Ἰουδαίων,*
13 *ἐλθὼν πρὸς ἐμὲ *καὶ ἐπιστὰς* εἶπέν μοι·*
Σαοὺλ ἀδελφέ, ἀνάβλεψον·
κἀγὼ αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἀνέβλεψα.
14 *καὶ εἶπέν μοι·*
Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν προεχειρίσατό σε
γνῶναι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἰδεῖν τὸν δίκαιον
καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ,
15 *ὅτι ἔσῃ μάρτυς αὐτοῦ πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους*
ὧν ἑώρακας καὶ ἤκουσας.
16 *καὶ νῦν, τί μέλλεις; ἀναστὰς βάπτισαι*
καὶ ἀπόλουσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου
ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.
17 *ἐγένετο δέ μοι ὑποστρέψαντι εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ*
προσευχομένου μου ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ
γενέσθαι με ἐν ἐκστάσει.
18 *καὶ εἶδον αὐτὸν λέγοντά μοι·*
Σπεῦσον καὶ ἔξελθε ἐν τάχει ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ,
διότι οὐ παραδέξονταί σου μαρτυρίαν περὶ ἐμοῦ.

λαλ. σοι *E* τέτακταί (ἐντέτακται *B*) σοι] σε δεῖ 𝔏^{dg} *vg.* 11 ἀνέστην *c.Th.*, 𝔏^{dg}, 𝔈, *Ephr.* (*hymni, ed. Lamy*, i. 204): *om. cett.* οὐκ ἐνέβλεπον] οὐκ ἔβλεπον *E*: οὐδὲν ἔβλ. *B*, *Ephr.* καὶ χειρ. 𝔏^{dg}: χειρ. δέ 𝔈: χειρ. *cett.* 12 δέ *om.* 𝔏^{d} εὐλαβής] εὐσεβής *E* 383: *om. A*, *vg.* κατοικούντων] + ἐν Δαμασκῷ δ, *vg.*^{qw}, 𝔈, *Chr.* $\frac{1}{2}$: + ἐκεῖ 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}: *om.* 𝔏^{d} (*fort. post* Ἰουδαίων *excidit* τῶν κατοικ. ἐν Δαμασκῷ) 13 καὶ ἐπιστάς *om.* 𝔏^{d}, 𝔖^{vg} Σαούλ] Saule, Saule 𝔏^{d} ἀνέβλεψα 𝔏^{d}, 𝔈: + εἰς αὐτόν *cett.* 14 καὶ εἶπέν μοι (*om.* μοι 𝔏^{g}) 𝔏^{dg}, 𝔖^{vg}: ὁ δὲ εἶπεν *cett.* 15 ἔσῃ *post* ἀνθρώπ. *hab. B* αὐτοῦ δ, 𝔏^{d} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}: αὐτῷ *cett.* ὧν τε *E* καὶ ἤκουσας *om.* 𝔏^{g} 16 ἀνάστα 𝔏^{dg} *vg.* 17 προσευχομένου μου 𝔏^{d}, *Chr.* $\frac{1}{2}$, *Amb.*: καὶ προσευχομένῳ *E*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*: καὶ προσευχομένου μου Γ δ γενέσθαι με ἐν ἐκστάσει *om.* 𝔖^{vg} 18 εἶδον ℵ, 𝔏^{d} *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Amb.*: ἰδεῖν *cett.* σου . . . ἐμοῦ] testimonium meum 𝔏^{d}

19 κἀγὼ εἶπον· Κύριε, αὐτοὶ ἐπίστανται
ὅτι ἐγὼ ἤμην φυλακίζων
καὶ δέρων κατὰ τὰς συναγωγὰς
τοὺς πιστεύοντας ἐπὶ σέ.
20 καὶ ὅτε ἐξεχύνετο τὸ αἷμα Στεφάνου τοῦ μάρτυρός σου,
ἐγὼ ἤμην ἐφεστὼς καὶ συνευδοκῶν
καὶ φυλάσσων τὰ ἱμάτια
τῶν ἀναιρούντων αὐτόν.
21 καὶ εἶπεν πρός με· Πορεύου,
ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰς ἔθνη μακρὰν ἐξαποστέλλω σε.
22 ἤκουσαν δὲ αὐτοῦ ἄχρι τούτου τοῦ λόγου,
καὶ ἐπῆραν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτῶν λέγοντες·
Αἶρε ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τὸν τοιοῦτον·
οὐ γὰρ καθῆκεν αὐτὸν ζῆν.
23 κραυγαζόντων δὲ *αὐτῶν*
καὶ ῥιπτόντων τὰ ἱμάτια
καὶ κονιορτὸν βαλλόντων εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν,
24 ἐκέλευσεν ὁ χιλίαρχος εἰσάγεσθαι αὐτὸν
εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν, εἴπας
μάστιξιν ἀνετάζειν αὐτὸν
ἵνα ἐπιγνῷ δι' ἣν αἰτίαν
οὕτως κατεφώνουν περὶ αὐτοῦ.
25 ὡς δὲ προέτειναν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἱμᾶσιν,

19 *πεπιστευκότας E* 20 ἐξεχεῖτο δ, *Chr.* πρωτομάρτυρος δ, 𝔖^{ph} σου *om.* 𝔏^{d} ἐγώ (*praem.* καί 𝔖) 𝔏^{dg} *vg.*, 𝔖 : καὶ αὐτός Γ *E* δ συνευδοκῶν] + τῇ ἀναιρέσει αὐτοῦ δ, 𝔖, *Chr.* 21 ἔθνη *cett.* (𝔏^{e}) : ἔθνος *E* (ad praedicandum gentibus 𝔖^{vg}) ἐξαποστέλλω (ἀποστ. *E*) *DE*, 𝔖^{vg} : ἐξαποστελῶ (ἀποστ. *B*) *cett. Ambst.* 22 ἤκουσαν *D* : ἤκουον Γ *E* δ καθῆκον *D*^{2} 23 κραζόντων *C* 614, *Chr.* δέ] τε *ABC* αὐτῶν *om. D* ῥιπτόντων *DE* : ῥιπτούντων Γ δ ἱμάτια] + αὐτῶν *E*, *vg.*, 𝔖, *Cass.* οὐρανόν *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Cass.* : ἀέρα *cett.* 24 ἀνετάζειν *D* : ἀνετάζεσθαι (ἐτάζ. *E*) *cett.* (caedi et torqueri *vg.*) κατεφώνουν περὶ (*om.* περί 614) αὐτοῦ *D* 614, 𝔏^{g} : ἐπεφώνουν αὐτῷ Γ *E* 383 25 προσέτειναν *DC* 614 ἑκατοντάρχην *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* : + ὁ Παῦλος *cett.* ἔξεστιν ὑμῖν ἄνθρ. Ῥωμ. καὶ ἀκατάκριτον *D*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : ἄνθρ. Ῥωμ. καὶ ἀκατάκρ. ἔξεστιν ὑμῖν (indemnatum vobis liceat flagellare Romanum, *Cass.*) *cett.* 26 τοῦτο ἀκούσας *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.* : ἀκούσας δέ *cett.* ἑκατόνταρχος *BE* δ ὅτι . . . λέγει *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*^{qw} : *om. cett.* ἀπήγγειλεν] ἐπήγγ. *D* (?) *sec. Wetstein.* αὐτῷ *D*, 𝔖^{ph} : λέγων (+ αὐτῷ 𝔖^{vg})

εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν ἑστῶτα ἑκατοντάρχην·
Εἰ ἔξεστιν ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπον Ῥωμαῖον
καὶ ἀκατάκριτον μαστίζειν;
26 τοῦτο ἀκούσας ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης,
ὅτι Ῥωμαῖον ἑαυτὸν λέγει,
προσελθὼν τῷ χιλιάρχῳ ἀπήγγειλεν αὐτῷ·
Ὅρα τί μέλλεις ποιεῖν·
ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος Ῥωμαῖός ἐστιν.
27 τότε προσελθὼν ὁ χιλίαρχος
ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν· Λέγε μοι, σὺ Ῥωμαῖος εἶ;
ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· Εἰμί.
28 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ χιλίαρχος εἶπεν·
⟨**Οὕτως εὐχερῶς σε Ῥωμαῖον λέγεις;**⟩
ἐγὼ οἶδα πόσου κεφαλαίου
τὴν πολιτείαν ταύτην ἐκτησάμην.
Παῦλος δὲ ἔφη· Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ γεγέννημαι.
29 τότε ἀπέστησαν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ
οἱ μέλλοντες αὐτὸν ἀνετάζειν· καὶ ὁ χιλίαρχος δὲ ἐφοβήθη,
ἐπιγνοὺς ὅτι Ῥωμαῖός ἐστιν καὶ ὅτι αὐτὸν ἦν δεδεκώς, **καὶ**
παραχρῆμα ἔλυσεν αὐτόν. 30 τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον βουλόμενος
γνῶναι τὸ ἀσφαλές, τὸ τί κατηγορεῖται ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων,
ἐκέλευσεν συνελθεῖν τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ πᾶν τὸ συνέδριον, καὶ
καταγαγὼν τὸν Παῦλον ἔστησεν εἰς αὐτούς.

cett. ὅρα *D* 383, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*^{q}, 𝔈 : *om. cett.* ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος *D*, *vg.*^{a} : hic enim 𝔏^{g} : ὁ γὰρ ἄνθρ. οὗτος *cett.* 27 τότε προσελθών *D* : προσ. δέ *cett.* ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν (+ λέγων 𝔈) *D*, 𝔈 : εἶπεν αὐτῷ (*om.* αὐτῷ 𝔏^{g}) *cett.* εἶπεν, εἰμί *D*, 𝔏^{g} : ἔφη, ναί *cett.* 28 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ χιλ. εἶπεν *D*, 𝔖^{vg} : ἀπεκρίθη δὲ (τε 383, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*) ὁ χιλ. *cett.* οὕτως εὐχερῶς (facile) σε Ῥωμαῖον λέγεις *cod. Bedae*, *vg.*$^{a, boh}$: *om. cett.* (*E*) οἶδα (+ γάρ *cod. Bed.*) πόσου *D*, *cod. Bedae* : πολλοῦ *cett.* (*E*) Παῦλος δέ *D* : ὁ δὲ Παῦλος Γ *E* δ δὲ καί] + ἐν αὐτῇ *vg.*^{q}, 𝔖, 𝔈 29 τότε *D* : εὐθέως οὖν (καὶ εὐθύς 𝔖) *cett.* ἐπιγνούς] cognovit enim 𝔏^{g} πολίτης Ῥωμαῖος *E*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.* καὶ ὅτι] ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτι 𝔏^{g} : ὅτι 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, 𝔏^{e} *vg.*^{a}, *Bl.* καὶ . . . αὐτόν 614, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈, *Cass.* : *om. cett.* 30 τῇ τε 614, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖 ἐπαύριον] ἐπιούσῃ ἐπαύριον 614 τὸ ἀσφαλές *om.* 𝔏^{g} κατηγορεῖτο 614, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph} ἐκέλευσεν 𝔈 : ἔλυσεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκέλευσεν Γ *E*, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} : πέμψας ἔλυσεν αὐτὸν (+ ἀπὸ τῶν δεσμῶν δ) καὶ ἐκέλευσεν δ, 𝔖^{ph} συνέδριον] + αὐτῶν 383, 𝔏^{g}

XXIII

1 Ἀτενίσας δὲ τῷ συνεδρίῳ ὁ Παῦλος εἶπεν· Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί,
ἐγὼ πάσῃ συνειδήσει ἀγαθῇ πεπολίτευμαι τῷ Θεῷ ἄχρι ταύτης
τῆς ἡμέρας. 2 ὁ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀνανίας ἐπέταξεν τοῖς
παρεστῶσιν αὐτῷ τύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ στόμα. 3 τότε ὁ
Παῦλος πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπεν· Τύπτειν σε μέλλει ὁ Θεός, τοῖχε
κεκονιαμένε. καὶ σὺ κάθῃ κρίνων με κατὰ τὸν νόμον, καὶ
παρανομῶν κελεύεις με τύπτεσθαι; 4 οἱ δὲ παρεστῶτες
εἶπαν· Τὸν ἀρχιερέα τοῦ Θεοῦ λοιδορεῖς; 5 ἔφη τε ὁ
Παῦλος· Οὐκ ᾔδειν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀρχιερεύς· γέγραπται
γάρ· Ἄρχοντα τοῦ λαοῦ σου οὐκ ἐρεῖς κακῶς. 6 γνοὺς
δὲ ὁ Παῦλος ὅτι τὸ ἓν μέρος ἐστὶν Σαδδουκαίων τὸ δὲ ἕτερον
Φαρισαίων ἔκραζεν ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ· Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐγὼ
Φαρισαῖός εἰμι, υἱὸς Φαρισαίων· περὶ ἐλπίδος καὶ ἀναστάσεως
νεκρῶν ἐγὼ κρίνομαι. 7 τοῦτο δὲ αὐτοῦ λαλήσαντος,
ἐγένετο στάσις τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων, καὶ ἐσχίσθη
τὸ πλῆθος. 8 Σαδδουκαῖοι μὲν γὰρ λέγουσιν μὴ εἶναι
ἀνάστασιν μήτε ἄγγελον μήτε πνεῦμα, Φαρισαῖοι δὲ ὁμολο-

XXXIII 1 τῷ συνεδρίῳ ὁ Παῦλος *cett. Cass. Luc.*: Παῦλος τῷ συνεδρίῳ *B* δ, 𝔖 2 ἐπέταξεν *post* αὐτῷ *hab.* 614, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Amb. Luc.* αὐτοῦ] τοῦ Παύλου 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Luc.* 3 κρίνων με] iudicare de me 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.* παρανομῶν] παρὰ τὸν νόμον *E* 4 τὸν ἀρχιερέα τοῦ θεοῦ (*om.* τοῦ θεοῦ 𝔏^{g}) λοιδορεῖς] sic insilis in sacerdotem dei dicendo *Cypr.* (οὕτως ἐμπαίζεις τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ τοῦ θεοῦ λοιδορῶν *Bl.*): iniuriam facis principi sacerdotum *Aug.* 5 ἔφη τε (δέ 614, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}) *cett.*: ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν *Cypr.* γάρ] + ὅτι ℵ *AB* 6 ὁ Παῦλος *om.* 𝔏^{gp} ἔκραξεν *AE* 383 Φαρισαίων Γ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, *Tert.*: Φαρισαίου *E* δ, 𝔖, 𝔈 ἐλπίδος] + νῦν *Tert.* (et de spe 𝔖) καὶ ἀναστάσεως *cett. Tert. Cass.*: τῆς ἀναστ. 𝔖, 𝔈^{vt} νεκρῶν *om. Tert.* ἐγώ *om. B*, *Tert.* κρίνομαι] + παρ' ὑμῖν *Tert.*: ὑφ' ὑμῶν κρίνομαι σήμερον 𝔏^{g} 7 λαλήσαντος *C* δ: λαλοῦντος *B*: εἰπόντος ℵ *AE* ἐγένετο] ἐπέπεσεν *B* Σαδδ. καὶ Φαρισ. ℵ *E* 614, 𝔖^{ph} διεσχίσθη *E* (καὶ ἐσχίσθη τὸ πλῆθος *del. Bl.*) 8 μὲν *om. B*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} τὰ ἀμφότερα] πάντα ταῦτα 𝔖^{vg}: εἶναι ἀνάστασιν καὶ ἄγγελον καὶ πνεῦμα 𝔏^{h}, 𝔈, *Bl.* (καὶ μὴν τρία ἐστί. πῶς οὖν λέγει ἀμφότερα; *Chr.*) 9 ἐγένετο . . . μεγάλη] et cum clamor ortus esset inter eos divi[debantur] 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.* ἀναστάντες *om.* 𝔏^{h} τῶν γραμματέων τοῦ μέρους *om. AE*, *vg.* διεμάχοντο] co[ntradice]bant 𝔏^{h} πρὸς ἀλλήλους ℵ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}: *om. cett.* οὐδὲν (ὅτι οὐδέν 𝔏^{g}) . . . τούτῳ] quid autem mali in hoc homine [inveni]mus 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.* μὴ

γοῦσιν τὰ ἀμφότερα. 9 ἐγένετο δὲ κραυγὴ μεγάλη, καὶ
ἀναστάντες τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων τοῦ μέρους τῶν Φαρισαίων
διεμάχοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες· Οὐδὲν κακὸν εὑρίσκομεν
ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ· εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ ἢ ἄγγελος,
μὴ θεομαχῶμεν. 10 πολλῆς δὲ γενομένης στάσεως
φοβηθεὶς ὁ χιλίαρχος μὴ διασπασθῇ ὁ Παῦλος ὑπ' αὐτῶν
ἐκέλευσεν τὸ στράτευμα καταβῆναι καὶ ἁρπάσαι αὐτὸν ἐκ
μέσου αὐτῶν, ἄγειν τε εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν. 11 τῇ δὲ
ἐπιούσῃ νυκτὶ ἐπιστὰς αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος εἶπεν· Θάρσει, **Παῦλε·**
ὡς γὰρ διεμαρτύρω τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, οὕτως σε
δεῖ καὶ εἰς Ῥώμην μαρτυρῆσαι. 12 γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας
ποιήσαντές τινες τῶν Ἰουδαίων συστροφὴν ἀνεθεμάτισαν
ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντες μήτε φαγεῖν μήτε πιεῖν ἕως οὗ ἀποκτείνωσιν
τὸν Παῦλον. 13 ἦσαν δὲ πλείους τεσσεράκοντα οἱ ταύτην
τὴν συνωμοσίαν ποιησάμενοι· 14 οἵτινες προσελθόντες
τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις εἶπαν· Ἀναθέματι
ἀνεθεματίσαμεν ἑαυτοὺς μηδενὸς γεύσασθαι **τὸ καθόλου** ἕως οὗ
ἀποκτείνωμεν τὸν Παῦλον. 15 νῦν οὖν **ἐρωτῶμεν ὑμᾶς ἵνα
τοῦτο ἡμῖν ποιήσητε· συναγαγόντες τὸ συνέδριον** ἐμφανίσατε

θεομαχῶμεν δ, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Chr.*: quid est in hoc $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.* 10 *γενομένης*] + *ἐν αὐτοῖς* $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Luc.* *ὑπ' αὐτῶν ὁ Παῦλος* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *τὸ στράτευμα*] numerum [. . . . . .] $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *ἀριθμὸν στρατιωτῶν Bl.* *καταβῆναι καί* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Luc.*: *καταβάν cett.* *αὐτόν ante εἰς τήν hab.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.* *ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν ἄγειν τε cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$): *om. Luc.*: *ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν om.* ℵ 11 Παῦλε 383, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$ *vg.*^{q}, *Ambst. Cass.*: *om. cett. Luc.* *τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *σε om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ 12 *δέ cett. Luc.*: *τε B* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ *τινὲς τῶν* Ἰουδαίων *συστ.* 383, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Luc.*: *συστ. οἱ* Ἰουδαῖοι (*οἱ* Ἰουδ. *συστροφήν* 614, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$) *cett. Cass.* *λέγοντες cett.* (*c.Th.*): *om. C*, $\mathfrak{S}$, *Chr.* 13 *οἱ ταύτην . . . ποιησάμενοι* (*πεποιηκότες* δ) *cett.*: qui se devoverant $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Bl.*: qui invicem iuramentum hoc fecerant $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: qui pacti fuerant cum iuramentis hoc pactum $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ 14 *οἵτινες προσελθόντες* (*προσῆλθον* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.*) *cett.*: *προσῆλθον οὖν* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{E}$ *τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις* (*τοῖς πρεσβ. καί ante τοῖς ἀρχ. hab.* $\mathfrak{E}^{vt}$) *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$): *om. Luc.*: *del. Bl.* *εἶπαν*] dicentes $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: indicaverunt dicentes *Luc. Bl.* *ἀναθέματι om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *τὸ καθόλου* $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, *Luc.*: *om. cett.* (omnino *ante ἀναθέματι hab.* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$) 15 *ἐρωτῶμεν . . . ποιήσητε* (praestetis $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$) *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: *om. cett.* *συναγαγόντες τὸ συνέδριον c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Luc.*: *om. cett.* *ἐμφανίσατε τῷ χιλιάρχῳ c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Luc.*: petite a tribuno $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: petite vos et principes synedrii a tribuno $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *ὑμεῖς ἐμφαν. τῷ χιλ. σὺν τῷ συνεδρίῳ cett.*

τῷ χιλιάρχῳ ὅπως καταγάγῃ αὐτὸν εἰς ὑμᾶς, ὡς μέλλοντας
διαγινώσκειν ἀκριβέστερον τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ· ἡμεῖς δὲ πρὸ τοῦ
ἐγγίσαι αὐτὸν ἕτοιμοί ἐσμεν τοῦ ἀνελεῖν αὐτόν, **ἐὰν δέῃ καὶ**
ἀποθανεῖν. 16 ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀδελφῆς Παύλου
τὴν ἔνεδραν παραγενόμενος καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν
ἀπήγγειλεν τῷ Παύλῳ. 17 προσκαλεσάμενος δὲ ὁ Παῦλος
ἕνα τῶν ἑκατοντάρχων ἔφη· Τὸν νεανίαν τοῦτον ἀπάγαγε πρὸς
τὸν χιλίαρχον· ἔχει γάρ τι ἀπαγγεῖλαι αὐτῷ. 18 ὁ μὲν
οὖν παραλαβὼν τὸν νεανίαν ἤγαγεν πρὸς τὸν χιλίαρχον καί
φησιν· Ὁ δέσμιος Παῦλος προσκαλεσάμενός με ἠρώτησεν
τοῦτον τὸν νεανίσκον ἀγαγεῖν πρός σε, ἔχοντά τι λαλῆσαί σοι·
19 ἐπιλαβόμενος δὲ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ὁ χιλίαρχος καὶ ἀνα-
χωρήσας κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπυνθάνετο· Τί ἐστιν ὃ ἔχεις ἀπαγγεῖλαί
μοι; 20 εἶπεν δὲ ὅτι Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι συνέθεντο τοῦ ἐρωτῆσαί
σε, ὅπως αὔριον τὸν Παῦλον καταγάγῃς εἰς τὸ συνέδριον ὡς
μέλλοντές τι ἀκριβέστερον πυνθάνεσθαι περὶ αὐτοῦ. 21 σὺ
οὖν μὴ πεισθῇς αὐτοῖς· ἐνεδρεύουσιν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐξ αὐτῶν

15 ὅπως] + αὔριον δ   καταγάγῃ] deducant 𝔏^{h} εἰς ἡμᾶς *c.Th.*   μέλλοντας] μέλλοντες 𝔏^{h} *vg.*, 𝔈   διαγινώσκειν (+ τι 𝔖^{ph}) . . . τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ *cett.* : ἀκριβ. (+ τι 𝔏^{h}) διαγιγν. τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ *C* 614, 𝔏^{h} : diligentius de eo (de eo dilig. *Luc.*) cognituros nos 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.*   πρὸ τοῦ ἐγγίσαι αὐτόν (+ πρὸς ὑμᾶς 𝔖, *Bl.*) *cett.* : *om.* 𝔏^{h} ἐσμέν] ἐσόμεθα 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.*   ἐὰν δέῃ καὶ (+ ἡμᾶς 𝔏^{h}) ἀποθανεῖν *c.Th.* 614, 𝔏^{h} : *om. cett.*   16 ὁ υἱός] iuvenis filius 𝔏^{h} ἔνεδραν] + αὐτῶν 𝔏^{gh} *vg.*^{q}, 𝔈, *Bl.* : + ταύτην 𝔖   παραγενόμενος . . . τῷ Παύλῳ *cett.* : ve[nit ad cas]tra et intravit ad Paulum et indicavit ei 𝔏^{h} (*om.* παραγενόμενος καί 𝔈)   17 δέ] τε 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg} ἔφη] + αὐτῷ 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖, *Bl.*   ἄπαγε ℵ *B*   τι *cett.* (quod illi indicet 𝔏^{h}) : *om. ABE*   18 ὁ μὲν οὖν] qui confestim 𝔏^{h} τὸν νεανίαν 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : αὐτόν *cett.*   ἤγαγεν . . . φησιν] ait ad tribunum 𝔏^{g} (*vocc.* ἔχει . . . χιλίαρχον *bis scr. in* 𝔏^{h})   προσκαλεσάμενος *om.* 𝔏^{g} με *cett.* (𝔏^{e}) : *om. E*, 𝔏^{g} ἠρώτησεν] + a me 𝔖   τὸν νεανίσκον] τὸν νεανίαν *B* δ, *Chr.* : *om.* 𝔏^{h} (τοῦτον *post* τὸν νεαν. *hab.* 614, 𝔖^{ph})   19 χιλίαρχος] tribunus [. . . . . . .]nes 𝔏^{h} (homi- *suppl. Berg.* : apud om- *Buch.* : eiecit om- *Zahn*)   ἀναχωρήσας . . . ἐπυνθάνετο] secessit cum eo (+ seorsum *vg.*) et inquirebat ab eo (*om.* ab eo 𝔏^{g}) 𝔏^{gh} *vg.* : *cf.* 𝔖^{vg} τί ἐστιν . . . μοι] quid [esset q]uod haberet ei dicere 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.*   20 εἶπεν δέ] et dixit 𝔏^{g} : qui ait 𝔏^{h} ὅτι *om.* 𝔏^{gh} *vg.*   καταγάγῃς τὸν Παῦλον δ, 𝔏^{gh} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} μέλλοντες 𝔏^{ghs} *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈 : μελλόντων 614 : μέλλων (-ον ℵ) Γ *E* : μέλλοντα 383   τι ἀκριβέστερον . . . περὶ (παρ' *Chr.*) αὐτοῦ] certius ab eo aliquid inquirere 𝔏^{h} : aliquid amplius discere ab eo 𝔖^{vg} 21 αὐτοῖς

ἄνδρες πλείους τεσσεράκοντα, οἵτινες ἀνεθεμάτισαν ἑαυτοὺς
μήτε φαγεῖν μήτε πιεῖν ἕως οὗ ἀνέλωσιν ἀυτόν, καὶ νῦν ἕτοιμοί
εἰσιν προσδεχόμενοι τὴν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐπαγγελίαν. 22 ὁ μὲν
οὖν χιλίαρχος ἀπέλυσεν τὸν νεανίσκον, παραγγείλας μηδενὶ
ἐκλαλῆσαι ὅτι ταῦτα ἐνεφάνισας πρός με. 23 καὶ προσ-
καλεσάμενος δύο τινὰς τῶν ἑκατονταρχῶν εἶπεν· Ἑτοιμάσατε
στρατιώτας, ὅπως πορευθῶσιν ἕως Καισαρείας, ἱππεῖς ἑκατὸν
καὶ δεξιολάβους διακοσίους· καὶ ἀπὸ τρίτης ὥρας τῆς νυκτὸς
**κελεύει ἑτοίμους εἶναι πορεύεσθαι· 24 καὶ τοῖς ἑκατοντάρχοις
παρήγγειλεν** κτήνη παραστῆσαι, ἵνα ἐπιβιβάσαντες τὸν Παῦλον
διὰ νυκτὸς διασώσωσιν **εἰς Καισάρειαν** πρὸς Φήλικα τὸν ἡγε-
μόνα· **ἐφοβήθη γὰρ μήποτε ἁρπάσαντες αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπο-
κτείνωσιν καὶ αὐτὸς μεταξὺ ἔγκλησιν ἔχῃ ὡς ἀργύριον εἰληφώς,**
25 ἔγραψεν δὲ ἐπιστολὴν ἔχουσαν τὸν τύπον τοῦτον· 26 Κλαύ-
διος Λυσίας τῷ κρατίστῳ ἡγεμόνι Φήλικι χαίρειν. 27 τὸν
ἄνδρα τοῦτον συλλημφθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ μέλλοντα
ἀναιρεῖσθαι ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐπιστὰς σὺν τῷ στρατεύματι ἐξειλάμην,

om. 𝔏^{g} ἐνεδρεύουσιν . . . τεσσεράκοντα] sunt enim ex eis plus homi[num XL] parati qui eum interficiant 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.* μήτε φαγεῖν μήτε πιεῖν *cett.*: [se nul]lam rem gustaturos 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.* ἕως οὗ ἀνέλωσιν αὐτόν] quoad usque hoc agant 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.* ἕτοιμοί εἰσιν δ, 𝔏^{ghs} *vg.*: εἰσὶν ἕτοιμοι Γ *E* 22 ὁ μὲν οὖν] καί 𝔏^{h} : τότε 𝔏^{g} νεανίσκον Γ *E* : νεανίαν δ μηδενὶ ἐκλαλῆσαι] ne quis sciret 𝔏^{gh}, 𝔖^{vg} (ὅπως μηδεὶς εἰδῇ *Bl.*) ὅτι . . . πρός με (ἐμέ ℵ *B*) *cett.*: quod sibi nuntiasset 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.*: quoniam haec nota sibi fecisset *vg.* 23 τινάς (*ante* δύο ℵ *B*) Γ δ, 𝔖^{ph}: *om. cett.* εἶπεν] + αὐτοῖς *vg.*, 𝔖 στρατιώτας 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.*: + διακοσίους *cett.* ὅπως] qui 𝔏^{h} πορευθῶσιν] eant [. . . . . .] 𝔏^{h} (armati *suppl. Buch.*: *fort.* nocte) εἰς Καισάρειαν 614 ἱππεῖς 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.*: καὶ ἱππεῖς *cett.* ἑκατόν *c.Th.* 614, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔈: XX 𝔏^{g} : ἑβδομήκοντα *cett.* δεξιοβόλους *A*, 𝔖^{vg} : pedites 𝔏^{h} καὶ ἀπό 𝔏^{h} : ἀπό *cett.* (qui exeant a tertia hora noctis 𝔖^{vg}) κελεύει ἑτοίμους εἶναι (parati estote *c.Th.*) πορεύεσθαι *c.Th.*, 𝔏^{h} *vg.*^{w} : *om. cett.* 24 καὶ τοῖς ἑκατ. παρήγγειλεν *c.Th.*, 𝔏^{h} : *om. cett.* κτήνη 𝔏^{h} : κτήνη τε *cett.* διὰ (*om.* 614) νυκτός (*post* διασώσ. *c.Th.*, 𝔏^{h}) *c.Th.* 614, 𝔏^{h} : *om. cett.* εἰς Καισάρειαν 614, 𝔖^{ph}, *Ephr.*: *om. cett.* ἐφοβήθη γὰρ . . . εἰληφώς 614, 𝔏^{gp2} *vg.*^{aw}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Cass.*: *om. cett.* 25 ἔγραψεν δέ (+ et dedit eis 𝔖^{vg}) *c.Th.*, 𝔏^{gs}, 𝔖^{vg} : γράψας *cett.* ἔχουσαν (περιέχ. *A* 383) τὸν τύπον τοῦτον *cett.*: περιέχουσαν τάδε 614, *vg.*: ἐν ᾗ ταῦτα *c.Th.*, 𝔖^{vg} 27 ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀναιρεῖσθαι 𝔏^{g}

μαθὼν ὅτι Ῥωμαῖός ἐστιν. 28 βουλόμενός τε ἐπιγνῶναι
τὴν αἰτίαν δι' ἣν ἐνεκάλουν αὐτῷ, κατήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ
συνέδριον αὐτῶν· 29 ὃν εὑρὼν ἐγκαλούμενον περὶ ζητη-
μάτων τοῦ νόμου **Μωσέως καὶ Ἰησοῦ τινός**, μηδὲν δὲ ἄξιον
θανάτου ἢ δεσμῶν ἔγκλημα ἔχοντα **ἐξήγαγον αὐτὸν μόλις τῇ
βίᾳ**. 30 μηνυθείσης δέ μοι ἐπιβουλῆς εἰς τὸν ἄνδρα ἔσεσθαι
ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἔπεμψα πρός σε, παραγγείλας καὶ τοῖς κατηγόροις
λέγειν τὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπὶ σοῦ· ἔρρωσο. 31 οἱ μὲν οὖν
στρατιῶται κατὰ τὸ διατεταγμένον αὐτοῖς ἀναλαβόντες τὸν
Παῦλον ἤγαγον διὰ νυκτὸς εἰς τὴν Ἀντιπατρίδα, 32 τῇ δὲ
ἐπαύριον ἐάσαντες τοὺς ἱππεῖς ἀπέρχεσθαι σὺν αὐτῷ ὑπ-
έστρεψαν εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν· 33 οἵτινες εἰσελθόντες εἰς
τὴν Καισάρειαν καὶ ἀναδόντες τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τῷ ἡγεμόνι,
παρέστησαν καὶ τὸν Παῦλον αὐτῷ. 34 ἀναγνοὺς δὲ **τὴν
ἐπιστολὴν** ἐπηρώτησεν· Ἐκ ποίας ἐπαρχίας εἶ; **ἔφη, Κίλιξ·**
καὶ πυθόμενος ἔφη· 35 Ἀκούσομαί σου, ὅταν οἱ κατήγοροί
σου παραγένωνται, κελεύσας ἐν τῷ πραιτωρίῳ τοῦ Ἡρῴδου
φυλάσσεσθαι αὐτόν.

XXIV

1 Μετὰ δὲ πέντε ἡμέρας κατέβη ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀνανίας μετὰ

27 *μαθὼν ὅτι Ῥωμαῖός ἐστιν*] clamantem ac dicentem se esse civem Romanum 𝔏g, *Bl.* 28 *τε* Γ *E*, *vg.*: *δέ* δ, 𝔏eg, 𝔖ph *γνῶναι* *E* 383 *κατήγαγον αὐτὸν* (*om.* *αὐτόν* ℵ *A* 614) *εἰς τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν* (*om.* *αὐτῶν* 𝔏g) *cett.* : *om.* *B*[1] 29 *εὑρών* δ : *εὗρον* *cett.* *ἐγκαλούμενον*] nihil amplius accusari quam 𝔏g, *Bl.* *ζητημάτων* *om.* 𝔏g Μωσέως *καὶ* Ἰησοῦ *τινός* *c.Th.* 614, 𝔏g : *αὐτῶν* *cett.* *ἢ δεσμῶν* *om.* 𝔏g *ἔγκλημα ἔχοντα* *E* δ : *ἔχοντα ἔγκλημα* Γ : facientem 𝔏g, *Bl.* *ἐξήγαγον . . . βίᾳ* 614, 𝔏g, 𝔖ph : *om.* *cett.* 30 *ἐπιβουλῆς*] + *ὑπὸ τῶν* Ἰουδαίων (*post* *ἔσεσθαι* 383, 𝔈) 383, 𝔏g *vg.*w, 𝔖vg, 𝔈 *ἐξ αὐτῶν* *cett.* : *ἐξαυτῆς* *B* δ, 𝔖vg, 𝔈 *κατηγόροις*] + *αὐτοῦ* *E*, 𝔖vg, 𝔈 *λέγειν . . . ἐπὶ σοῦ*] venire ad tuam cognitionem 𝔏g, *Bl.* *τὰ* (*om.* *B*) *πρὸς αὐτόν*] *αὐτούς* ℵ *A* : *om.* 𝔏g *vg.* *ἔρρωσο* ℵ *E* δ, *vg.*a, 𝔖 : *om.* *AB*, 𝔏gp, 𝔈 31 *αὐτοῖς* *om.* 𝔏g 32–3 *ἐάσαντες . . . εἰσελθόντες* (*ἐλθ-* δ) *cett.* : relictis militibus ad castra cum solis equitibus venerunt 𝔏g, *Bl.* 33 *καὶ τὸν* Παῦλον *om.* *E* : *post* *αὐτῷ* *hab.* *vg.* 34 *ἀναγνοὺς δέ*] + *ὁ ἡγεμών* 383, 𝔈 *τὴν ἐπιστολήν* *c.Th.* δ, 𝔏g : *om.* *cett.* *ἐπηρώτησεν* *c.Th.* δ, 𝔏g, 𝔈 : *καὶ ἐπερωτήσας* *cett.* *εἶ* *c.Th.* δ : *ἐστίν* *cett.* *ἔφη*, Κίλιξ δ : *καὶ ἔφη*, Κιλικίας *c.Th.* : *om.* *cett.* *καὶ πυθόμενος ἔφη* *c.Th.* δ, 𝔏g : *καὶ πυθ.* *ὅτι ἀπὸ* Κιλικίας (+ *ἐστίν* ℵ *A*) *cett.* 35 *ἀκούσομαι* 614 : *διακούσομαι*

πρεσβυτέρων τινῶν καὶ ῥήτορος Τερτύλλου τινός, οἵτινες
ἐνεφάνισαν τῷ ἡγεμόνι κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου. 2 κληθέντος δὲ
αὐτοῦ, ἤρξατο κατηγορεῖν ὁ Τέρτυλλος λέγων· 3 Πολλῆς
εἰρήνης τυγχάνοντες διὰ σοῦ, καὶ διορθωμάτων γινομένων τῷ
ἔθνει τούτῳ διὰ τῆς σῆς προνοίας πάντῃ τε καὶ πανταχοῦ ἀπο-
δεχόμεθα, κράτιστε Φῆλιξ, μετὰ πάσης εὐχαριστίας. 4 ἵνα
δὲ μὴ ἐπὶ πλεῖόν σε ἐγκόπτω, παρακαλῶ ἀκοῦσαί σε ἡμῶν
συντόμως τῇ σῇ ἐπιεικείᾳ. 5 εὑρόντες γὰρ τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦ-
τον λοιμὸν καὶ κινοῦντα στάσεις πᾶσιν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς
κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην, πρωτοστάτην τε τῆς τῶν Ναζωραίων
αἱρέσεως, 6 ὃς καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπείρασεν βεβηλῶσαι, ὃν
καὶ ἐκρατήσαμεν **καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἡμέτερον νόμον ἠθελήσαμεν
κρῖναι·** 7 **παρελθὼν δὲ Λυσίας ὁ χιλίαρχος μετὰ πολλῆς
βίας ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν ἀπήγαγεν,** 8 **κελεύσας τοὺς
κατηγόρους αὐτοῦ ἔρχεσθαι πρός σε·** παρ' οὗ δυνήσῃ αὐτὸς
ἀνακρίνας περὶ πάντων τούτων ἐπιγνῶναι ὧν ἡμεῖς κατηγοροῦ-
μεν αὐτοῦ. 9 **εἰπόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα** συνεπέθεντο καὶ οἱ
Ἰουδαῖοι φάσκοντες ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχειν. 10 ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ὁ
Παῦλος νεύσαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος **ἀπολογίαν ἔχειν ὑπὲρ
ἑαυτοῦ· ὁ δὲ σχῆμα ἔνθεον ἀναλαβὼν ἔφη·** Ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν
ὄντα σε κριτὴν **δίκαιον** τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ ἐπιστάμενος, εὐθύμως

Γ *E* 383 σου *om. c.Th.* ὅταν *c.Th.*, 𝔏^{g} : ἔφη, ὅταν *cett.* οἱ δ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖 : καὶ οἱ Γ *E* κελεύσας] ἐκέλευσε τε 383, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 τοῦ] τῷ *B*
XXIV 1 τινός *om.* 614, 𝔖 2 αὐτοῦ] τοῦ Παύλου *vg.* 3 διὰ σοῦ *om.* 𝔏^{g} κατορθωμάτων 383, *Chr.* τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ *om. vg.* ἀποδεχόμεθα] +gratiam tuam 𝔖 (*om.* μετὰ πάσης εὐχαρ. 𝔖^{vg}) 5 πᾶσιν . . . οἰκουμένην] non tantum generi nostro sed fere universo orbi terrarum et omnibus Iudaeis 𝔏^{g} (*duabus lectionibus conflatis*): οὐ μόνον τῷ γένει ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν πάσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ *Bl.* 6–7 καὶ κατὰ . . . ἀπήγαγεν (ἀπήγ. *post* βίας *hab.* 𝔏^{g} *vg.*) *E* 614, 𝔏^{gp2} *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖, *Cass.*: *om.* Γ 383, 𝔏^{s}, 𝔈 8 κελεύσας . . . πρός σε (ἐπί σε 614, *Chr.*) *E* 614, 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖, *Cass. Chr.*: *om. cett.* (𝔏^{g}) παρ' ᾧ *E* αὐτός *om.* *A*[1], 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, 𝔈 9 εἰπόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα 614, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett.* συνεπέθεντο 614 : συνεπ. δέ *cett.* (𝔖^{ph}) 10 δέ 383, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph} : τε *cett.* ἀπολογίαν . . . ἑαυτοῦ *c.Th.*, *Ephr.*: λέγειν (λέγων 𝔏^{g}, *Cass.*: λαλεῖν 614) *cett.* ὁ δὲ σχῆμα ἔνθεον ἀναλαβὼν ἔφη *c.Th.*: *om. cett.* ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν (ἐνιαυτῶν *E*) ὄντα σε κριτήν *cett.* : ex multis annis es iudex *c.Th.* δίκαιον *E* 614, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.* $\frac{2}{3}$: *om. cett* ἐπιστάμενος *ante* ἐκ πολλῶν *hab.* 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈 : *om. c.Th.*

τὰ περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ ἀπολογοῦμαι, 11 *δυναμένου σου ἐπιγνῶναι*
ὅτι οὐ πλείους εἰσίν μοι ἡμέραι δώδεκα ἀφ' ἧς ἀνέβην προσ-
κυνήσων εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. 12 *καὶ οὔτε ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εὗρόν με*
πρός τινα διαλεγόμενον ἢ ἐπίστασιν ποιοῦντα ὄχλου, οὔτε ἐν
ταῖς συναγωγαῖς οὔτε κατὰ τὴν πόλιν· 13 *οὔτε παραστῆ-*
σαι δύνανταί σοι περὶ ὧν νυνὶ κατηγοροῦσίν μου. 14 *ὁμο-*
λογῶ δὲ τοῦτό σοι ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν λέγουσιν αἵρεσιν
οὕτως λατρεύω τῷ πατρῴῳ Θεῷ, πιστεύων πᾶσιν τοῖς κατὰ τὸν
νόμον καὶ τοῖς ἐν τοῖς προφήταις γεγραμμένοις, 15 *ἐλπίδα*
ἔχων εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ἣν καὶ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι προσδέχονται, ἀνάστασιν
μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων. 16 *ἐν τούτῳ καὶ*
αὐτὸς ἀσκῶ ἀπρόσκοπον συνείδησιν ἔχειν διὰ παντὸς πρὸς
τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. 17 *δι' ἐτῶν δὲ πλειόνων*
ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσων εἰς τὸ ἔθνος μου παρεγενόμην καὶ
προσφοράς· 18 *ἐν αἷς εὗρόν με ἡγνισμένον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, οὐ*
μετὰ ὄχλου οὐδὲ μετὰ θορύβου, τινὲς δὲ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας
Ἰουδαίων— 19 *οὓς ἔδει ἐπὶ σοῦ παρεῖναι καὶ κατηγορεῖν*
εἴ τι ἔχοιεν πρὸς ἐμέ. 20 *ἢ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι εἰπάτωσαν τί εὗρον*
ἐν ἐμοὶ *ἀδίκημα στάντος μου ἐπὶ τοῦ συνεδρίου,* 21 *ἢ περὶ*

11 *ἐπιγνῶναι*] verum scire 𝔏g *προσκυνῆσαι* *E* 614 12 *κατὰ τὴν πόλιν*] in foro *c.Th.* 13 *οὔτε* *AE* δ, *Chr.*: *οὐδέ* ℵ *B* *παραστῆσαι*] + *τι* 𝔏g *vg.*a *σοι* *om.* 383, 𝔏g, 𝔖ph, ℭ *νῦν* *E* 383, *Chr.* 14 *αἵρεσιν*] *καὶ αἵρεσιν* *c.Th.* (secundum sectam quam dicunt isti 𝔏g) *πᾶσιν* *om.* *B* *τοῖς ἐν τοῖς* ℵ *BE* 614: *ἐν τοῖς* *Epiph.*: *τοῖς* *cett.* 15 *ἐλπίδα*] + *δέ* 614 (et est mihi spes 𝔖vg) *ἀνάστασιν*] + *νεκρῶν* *E*, 𝔖vg *ἔσεσθαι*] + *νεκρῶν* δ, 𝔖ph 16 *καί*] *δέ* δ *ἔχων* δ, 𝔏g, *Chr.* *διὰ παντός* *hoc loco hab.* *E* 614, 𝔏g, 𝔖ph, ℭ; *post* *ἀνθρώπους* *cett.* *πρός*] + *τε* δ, 𝔖ph, *Chr.* *τούς*] *πρὸς τούς* 614, *vg.*, 𝔖ph, *Chr.* 17 *παρεγενόμην* *hoc loco hab.* ℵ *BC*, 𝔏gs *vg.*, *post* *καὶ προσφοράς* *E* 614 (*m.* 1), *post* *πλειόνων* 383 614 (*m.* 2), 𝔖, ℭ: *om.* *A* *προσφοράς*] oblationes et vota *vg.* (*cf.* iv. 21) 18 *θορύβου*] + *καὶ ἐπελάβοντό μου κράζοντες καὶ λέγοντες αἶρε τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἡμῶν* 𝔏p2 *vg.*aqw: *cf.* *Ephr.* clamaverunt de me ut amoveatur inter nos *τινὲς δέ*] *τινές* 383, *Chr.* *Bl.*: *om.* ℭ (nisi quod tumultuati sunt quidam 𝔖vg) *τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἰουδαίων* (-*αῖοι* *C*) *CE* 614, 𝔖ph: *ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἰουδαῖοι* *cett.* (*fort.* *τινὲς τῶν . . . Ἰουδαίων* *post* *εὗρόν με* *ponendum*) 20 *τί*] *εἴ τι* 614, 𝔏g *vg.*, 𝔖ph *ἐν ἐμοί* *CE* δ, 𝔏g *vg.*, 𝔖: *om.* ℵ *AB*, ℭ *συνεδρίου*] + *αὐτῶν* 𝔏g 21 *περὶ . . . φωνῆς*] de una hac solum modo voce 𝔏g *vg.* *ἐκέκραξα* Γ, *Chr.*: *ἔκραξα* *E* δ *ἐν αὐτοῖς ἑστώς* *om.* 𝔏g *ὑφ' ὑμῶν* ℵ *E*

μιᾶς ταύτης φωνῆς ἧς ἐκέκραξα ἐν αὐτοῖς ἑστὼς ὅτι Περὶ ἀνα-
στάσεως νεκρῶν ἐγὼ κρίνομαι σήμερον ὑφ' ὑμῶν. 22 Ἀνε-
βάλετο δὲ αὐτοὺς ὁ Φῆλιξ, ἀκριβέστερον εἰδὼς τὰ περὶ τῆς
ὁδοῦ, εἴπας· Ὅταν Λυσίας ὁ χιλίαρχος καταβῇ, διαγνώσομαι
τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς· 23 διαταξάμενος τῷ ἑκατοντάρχῃ τηρεῖσθαι
αὐτὸν ἔχειν τε ἄνεσιν καὶ μηδένα κωλύειν τῶν ἰδίων ὑπηρετεῖν
αὐτῷ. 24 μετὰ δὲ ἡμέρας τινὰς παρεγένετο ὁ Φῆλιξ σὺν
Δρουσίλλῃ τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ οὔσῃ Ἰουδαίᾳ, **ἥτις ἠρώτησεν
ἰδεῖν τὸν Παῦλον καὶ ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον. Θέλων οὖν χαρίζεσθαι
αὐτῇ** μετεπέμψατο τὸν Παῦλον καὶ ἤκουσεν αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς εἰς
Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν πίστεως. 25 διαλεγομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ περὶ
δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ τοῦ κρίματος τοῦ μέλλοντος,
ἔμφοβος γενόμενος ὁ Φῆλιξ ἀπεκρίθη· Τὸ νῦν ἔχον πορεύου,
καιρῷ δὲ ἐπιτηδείῳ μετακαλέσομαί σε, 26 ἅμα καὶ ἐλπίζων
ὅτι χρήματα δοθήσεται αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου **ὅπως λύσῃ αὐτόν**·
διὸ καὶ πυκνότερον αὐτὸν μεταπεμπόμενος **κατ' ἰδίαν** ὡμίλει
αὐτῷ. 27 διετίας δὲ πληρωθείσης ἔλαβεν διάδοχον ὁ Φῆλιξ
Πόρκιον Φῆστον, **τὸν δὲ Παῦλον εἴασεν ἐν τηρήσει διὰ Δρού-
σιλλαν.**

δ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph} : ἐφ' ὑμῶν *ABC*, 𝔏^{s}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 22 ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα ὁ (*om.* ὁ 614) Φῆλιξ ἀνεβάλλετο αὐτούς δ, 𝔈 τῆς ὁδοῦ] + ταύτης 𝔏^{gs} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} : + τοῦ Κυρίου *vg.*^{qw} : + τῆς ἀληθείας *vg.*^{a} εἴπας] + ὅτι *E* 614 καταβῇ *ante* Λυσίας *hab.* 𝔏^{g} διαγνώσομαι τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς] rursum audiam vos 𝔏^{g} : audiam vos *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} 23 διαταξάμενος] + τε 383, 𝔏^{gs} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} τηρεῖσθαι] diligenter custodire 𝔏^{g} αὐτόν] τὸν Παῦλον 383, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 τῶν ἰδίων] + αὐτοῦ Γ δ, 𝔖^{vg} ὑπηρετεῖν] + ἢ προσέρχεσθαι δ, 𝔈, *Chr.* 24 παρεγένετο *c.Th.* (?) : παραγενόμενος *cett.* (𝔖^{ph}) τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ א *c.Th.* *E* : τῇ ἰδίᾳ γυναικί (+ αὐτοῦ *A*) *AB* : τῇ γυναικί *C* δ ἥτις ἠρώτησεν . . . τὸν λόγον (*om.* τὸν λόγον *vg.*^{boh}) *c.Th.*, *vg.*^{boh} : *om. cett.* (rogatus Felix a Drusilla coniuge coram ea Paulum fecit adduci *Cass.*) θέλων . . . αὐτῇ *c.Th.* : *om. cett.* (*vg.*^{boh}) Ἰησοῦν *om.* *A* δ, *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 25 μέλλοντος] + ἔσεσθαι 383, *Chr.* καιρῷ δὲ ἐπιτηδείῳ *E*, 𝔏^{gs} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Cass.* : καιρὸν δὲ μεταλαβών *cett.* μεταπέμψομαί σε 614, 𝔖, 𝔈 (faciam te esse praesentem *Cass.*) 26 ὅτι . . . αὐτῷ (*om.* αὐτῷ *B*) *cett.* : se pecuniam accepturum 𝔏^{gs} ὅπως λύσῃ αὐτόν δ, 𝔈, *Chr.* : *om. cett.* κατ' ἰδίαν (secrete) 𝔏^{g}, *Tert.* : *om. cett.* (𝔏^{s}) 27 τὸν δὲ . . . Δρούσιλλαν *c.Th.* 614 : θέλων τε χάριτα (χάριν *E* δ) καταθέσθαι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὁ Φ. κατέλιπε τὸν Π. δεδεμένον *cett.* *Cass.* (*ex* XXV. 9)

XXV

1 Φῆστος οὖν ἐπιβὰς τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀνέβη εἰς
Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀπὸ Καισαρείας, 2 ἐνεφάνισάν τε αὐτῷ οἱ
ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου, καὶ
παρεκάλουν αὐτόν, 3 αἰτούμενοι χάριν κατ' αὐτοῦ ὅπως
μεταπέμψηται αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἐνέδραν ποιοῦντες ἀνελεῖν
αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν. 4 ὁ μὲν οὖν Φῆστος ἀπεκρίθη
τηρεῖσθαι τὸν Παῦλον εἰς Καισάρειαν, ἑαυτὸν δὲ μέλλειν ἐν
τάχει ἐκπορεύεσθαι· 5 Οἱ οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν, φησίν, δυνατοὶ
συγκαταβάντες, εἴ τί ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἄτοπον, κατηγορεί-
τωσαν αὐτοῦ. 6 διατρίψας δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἡμέρας οὐ πλείους
ὀκτὼ ἢ δέκα, καταβὰς εἰς Καισάρειαν, τῇ ἐπαύριον καθίσας
ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἐκέλευσεν τὸν Παῦλον ἀχθῆναι. 7 παρα-
γενομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ περιέστησαν αὐτὸν οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων
καταβεβηκότες Ἰουδαῖοι, πολλὰ καὶ βαρέα αἰτιώματα κατα-
φέροντες, ἃ οὐκ ἴσχυον ἀποδεῖξαι, 8 τοῦ Παύλου ἀπολο-
γουμένου ὅτι Οὔτε εἰς τὸν νόμον τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὔτε εἰς τὸ
ἱερὸν οὔτε εἰς Καίσαρά τι ἥμαρτον· 9 ὁ Φῆστος δὲ θέλων
τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις χάριν καταθέσθαι ἀποκριθεὶς τῷ Παύλῳ εἶπεν·
Θέλεις εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀναβὰς ἐκεῖ περὶ τούτων κριθῆναι ἐπ'
ἐμοῦ; 10 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Παῦλος· Ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος Καίσαρος

XXV 1 *ἐπιβάς*] + *ὁ ἡγεμών* *Luc.* *τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ* *BE* δ: *τῇ ἐπαρχίῳ* (-*είῳ* *A*) ℵ *A* *τρεῖς*] *δύο* 𝔏^{gs} (*om.* *μετά . . . ἡμέρας* *Luc.*) *ἀπὸ Καισαρείας . . . Ἱερουσαλήμ* (*v.* 3) *om.* *Luc.* 2 *τε*] *δέ* *E* δ 3 *κατ' αὐτοῦ*] *παρ' αὐτοῦ* *C*, 𝔖^{vg} *ἔνεδρον* 614, *Chr.* *ὁδόν*] + illi qui votum fecerant se pro virili [facturos esse] ut in manibus suis esset *c.Th.*, *Bl.* 4 *τὸν μὲν Παῦλον τηρεῖσθαι* 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.* *ἐν Καισαρείᾳ* δ, *vg.*, *Chr.* *μέλλειν* *om.* *E*, 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.* 5 *ἐν ὑμῖν φησὶν* (*om.* *φησίν* 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Luc.*) *δύνατοι* *cett.*: *δυνατοὶ ἐν ὑμῖν φησίν* δ *ἄτοπον*] *τούτῳ* 383, *Chr.*: *τούτῳ ἄτοπον* 614, 𝔖 6 *οὐ πλείους*] *πλείους* *E* δ: *om.* 𝔖, 𝔈 *ἀχθῆναι τὸν Παῦλον* *E*, 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.* 7 *αὐτόν*] *αὐτῷ* *E*: *om.* 383 *αἰτιάματα* 383 (*m.* 2) *καταφέροντες* Γ: *ἐπιφέροντες* *E*: *φέροντες* 383 (+ *τῷ Παύλῳ* *E*, + *κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου* 383, 𝔖^{ph}: + *κατ' αὐτοῦ* 𝔖^{vg}, *vg.*^{q}) *ἀποδεῖξαι* *ante* *οὐκ* *hab.* 𝔏^{g}, *Luc.* 8 *τοῦ δὲ Παύλου ἀπολογ.* *E*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}: *ἀπολογ. αὐτοῦ* 383, *Chr.* 9 *τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις* *post* *καταθέσθαι* *hab.* 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈 *ἀποκριθείς* *om.* 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg} *κριθῆναι*] *κρίνεσθαι* δ: iudicio contendere 𝔏^{g} 10 *ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ὁ Π. καὶ εἶπεν* 𝔖^{vg} *ἐπί . . . ἑστώς εἰμι*] *ἑστὼς ἐπί . . . εἰμί* ℵ, 𝔏^{g}: *ἑστὼς ἐπί . . . ἑστώς εἰμι* *B* *οὐδέν*] *οὐκ* 614 *ἠδίκησα* *ACE* δ:

ἑστώς εἰμι, οὗ με δεῖ κρίνεσθαι. Ἰουδαίους οὐδὲν ἠδίκησα,
ὡς καὶ σὺ κάλλιον ἐπιγινώσκεις. 11 εἰ μὲν οὖν ἀδικῶ καὶ
ἄξιον θανάτου πέπραχά τι, οὐ παραιτοῦμαι τὸ ἀποθανεῖν· εἰ
δὲ οὐδέν ἐστιν ὧν οὗτοι κατηγοροῦσίν μου, οὐδείς με δύναται
αὐτοῖς χαρίσασθαι. Καίσαρα ἐπικαλοῦμαι. 12 τότε ὁ
Φῆστος συλλαλήσας μετὰ τοῦ συμβουλίου ἀπεκρίθη· Καίσαρα
ἐπικέκλησαι, ἐπὶ Καίσαρα πορεύσῃ. 13 ἡμερῶν δὲ διαγε-
νομένων τινῶν Ἀγρίππας ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ Βερνίκη κατήντησαν
εἰς Καισάρειαν ἀσπασόμενοι τὸν Φῆστον. 14 ὡς δὲ πλείους
ἡμέρας διέτριβον ἐκεῖ, ὁ Φῆστος τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀνέθετο τὰ κατὰ
τὸν Παῦλον λέγων· Ἀνήρ τίς ἐστιν καταλελειμμένος ὑπὸ
Φήλικος δέσμιος, 15 περὶ οὗ γενομένου μου εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα
ἐνεφάνισάν **μοι** οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῶν Ἰουδαίων,
αἰτούμενοι κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ καταδίκην· 16 πρὸς οὓς ἀπεκρίθην
ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἔθος Ῥωμαίοις χαρίζεσθαί τινα ἄνθρωπον **εἰς
ἀπώλειαν** πρὶν ἢ ὁ κατηγορούμενος κατὰ πρόσωπον ἔχοι τοὺς
κατηγόρους, τόπον τε ἀπολογίας λάβοι περὶ τοῦ ἐγκλήματος.
17 συνελθόντων οὖν αὐτῶν ἐνθάδε ἀναβολὴν μηδεμίαν ποιησά-
μενος, τῇ ἑξῆς καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἐκέλευσα ἀχθῆναι
τὸν ἄνδρα· 18 περὶ οὗ σταθέντες οἱ κατήγοροι οὐδεμίαν
αἰτίαν ἔφερον ὧν ἐγὼ ὑπενόουν πονηρῶν, 19 ζητήματα δέ
τινα περὶ τῆς ἰδίας δεισιδαιμονίας εἶχον πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ περί

ἠδίκηκα ℵ *B* 11 οὖν] γάρ δ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph} : *om.* 𝔖^{vg}, *Bl.* καί] ἤ *E*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔈 τὸ ἀποθανεῖν] me morte dignum 𝔏^{g} κατηγοροῦσιν] + ἢ λέγουσιν 𝔏^{g}, *Bl.* μου] περί μου 𝔏^{g}, *Bl.* : in me *vg.*^{a} 13 ἡμερῶν . . . τινῶν] et cum dies multi (aliquot *vg.*, *Cass.*) transacti essent 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, *Cass.* Βερνίκη Γ δ, *vg.*, 𝔖 (*ita v.* 23): Βερενίκη *CE*, 𝔈 : Beronice 𝔏^{g}, *Cass.* ἀσπασόμενοι 383, 𝔏^{eg} *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈 : ἀσπασάμενοι Γ *E* 614 14 πλείους] aliquot 𝔏^{g} 15 ἐνεφάνισαν] ἐνεφάνησαν 383 : ἐνεφανίσθησαν *B* μοι *E*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔈 : *om. cett.* καταδίκην Γ : δίκην *E* δ, *Chr.* 16 εἰς ἀπώλειαν δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, 𝔈, *Chr.* : *om. cett.* κατηγορούμενος] κρινόμενος *c.Th.* κατὰ πρόσωπον *post* κατηγόρους *hab.* 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈 (veniat accusator eius et arguat 𝔖^{vg}) τε] δέ *BE* 614 περὶ τοῦ ἐγκλήματος] ad abluenda crimina quae ei obiciuntur *vg.*^{aw} (+ οὗ ἂν καταφέρωσιν αὐτοῦ *Bl.*) 17 αὐτῶν *om. B* (cum itaque huc venisset 𝔏^{g} : et cum venissem huc 𝔖^{vg}) μηδεμίαν ἀναβολήν *E*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.* 18 πονηρῶν *BE* : πονηρά ℵ, *vg.*^{aqw} : πονηράν (*post* αἰτίαν 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖) *AC* 614, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖 : πονηρόν 𝔈 : *om.* 383 19 εἶχον πρὸς αὐτόν] deferebant 𝔏^{g} (*post* τινα)

τινος Ἰησοῦ τεθνηκότος, ὃν ἔφασκεν ὁ Παῦλος ζῆν.
20 ἀπορούμενος δὲ ἐγὼ **εἰς** τὴν περὶ τούτων ζήτησιν ἔλεγον εἰ βούλοιτο πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα κἀκεῖ κρίνεσθαι περὶ τούτων.
21 τότε ὁ Παῦλος ἐπεκαλέσατο Καίσαρα **καὶ ᾐτήσατο** τηρηθῆναι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ διάγνωσιν, **ἐπειδή τε αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐδυνάμην κρῖναι,** ἐκέλευσα τηρεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ἕως οὗ ἀναπέμψω αὐτὸν πρὸς Καίσαρα.
22 Ἀγρίππας δὲ πρὸς τὸν Φῆστον **ἔφη·** Ἐβουλόμην καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀκοῦσαι. **ὁ δέ·** Αὔριον, φησίν, ἀκούσῃ αὐτοῦ.
23 τῇ οὖν ἐπαύριον ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἀγρίππα καὶ τῆς Βερνίκης μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας καὶ εἰσελθόντων εἰς τὸ ἀκροατήριον σύν τε χιλιάρχοις καὶ ἀνδράσιν τοῖς κατ' ἐξοχὴν τῆς πόλεως καὶ **τοῖς καταβεβηκόσιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπαρχίας,** ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Φῆστος ἀχθῆναι τὸν Παῦλον,
24 καί φησιν ὁ Φῆστος· Ἀγρίππα βασιλεῦ καὶ πάντες οἱ συμπαρόντες ἡμῖν ἄνδρες, θεωρεῖτε τοῦτον περὶ οὗ ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐνέτυχόν μοι ἔν τε Ἱεροσολύμοις καὶ ἐνθάδε, **ὅπως παραδῶ αὐτὸν εἰς βάσανον ἀναπολόγητον·**
25 **οὐκ ἠδυνήθην δὲ παραδοῦναι αὐτόν, διὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς ἃς ἔχομεν παρὰ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ. ἐὰν δέ τις αὐτοῦ κατηγορεῖν θέλῃ, ἔλεγον ἀκολουθεῖν μοι εἰς**

19 Ἰησοῦ τινός 𝔏g 20 εἰς *om.* Γ 383 (*m.* 1) περὶ τούτων (*post* κρίνεσθαι) *om.* 𝔏g, *Bl.* 21 τότε ὁ Παῦλος ἐπεκαλέσατο Καίσαρα καὶ ᾐτήσατο 𝔏g : τοῦ δὲ Παύλου ἐπικαλεσαμένου *cett.* ἐπειδή τε αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐδυνάμην κρῖναι 𝔏g : *om. cett.* ἕως οὗ] ut 𝔏g 22 ἔφη *om.* ℵ *AB*, 𝔏g (πρὸς τὸν Φῆστον *om.* 𝔖vg) ὁ δέ *om.* ℵ *AB*, 𝔏g *vg.* 23 οὖν] δέ 𝔏eg *vg.*, *Cass.* εἰσελθόντος *E* ἀνδράσιν *cett.* (𝔏e) : + καί *E* καὶ (*suppl. Bl.*) τοῖς καταβεβηκόσιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπαρχίας *c.Th.* : *om. cett.* ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Φῆστος ἀχθῆναι τὸν Παῦλον (*om.* ὁ Φῆστος 𝔏g) *c.Th.*, 𝔏gs : καὶ κελεύσαντος τοῦ Φήστου ἤχθη (ἦλθεν 𝔖) ὁ Παῦλος *cett.* 24 ὁ Φῆστος *om.* 𝔏g τοῦτον] τὸν ἄνδρα 𝔏g ἐνέτυχεν *B* 383 ἔν τε Ἱεροσολύμοις καὶ ἐνθάδε] ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις *vg.*aw ὅπως . . . θέλῃ (*v.* 25) *c.Th.*, *vg.*a, boh : *om. cett.* βάσανον *c.Th.* : θάνατον *vg.*a, boh 24–5 ἀναπολόγητον· οὐκ ἠδυνήθην δέ *c.Th.* : ἀκατηγόρητον δὲ (*om.* δέ *vg.*a) οὐκ ἠδυνήθην *vg.*a, boh 25 παρὰ τοῦ *om.* *vg.*a Σεβαστοῦ *c.Th.* : Καίσαρος *vg.*a, boh κατηγορεῖν θέλῃ *c.Th.* : κατηγορῇ *vg.*a : velit cum eo iudicio contendere *vg.*boh ἔλεγον ἀκολουθεῖν μοι *c.Th.* : ἀκολουθεῖν *vg.*a : *om. cett.* (*vg.*boh) εἰς Καισ. *c.Th.*, *vg.*a,boh : *om. cett.* οὗ ἐφυλάσσετο (φυλάσσεται *vg.*a) *c.Th.*, *vg.*a : *om. cett.* (*vg.*boh) οἵτινες ἐλθόντες ἐβόων *c.Th.*, *vg.*a : καὶ ἐβόων *vg.*boh : βοῶντες (ἐπιβοῶντες *E* δ) *cett.* ἵνα ἀρθῇ (αἴρετε αὐτόν *vg.*a) ἐκ τῆς ζωῆς *c.Th.*, *vg.*a : μὴ δεῖν (οὐ δεῖ 𝔏gs, 𝔖ph) αὐτὸν ζῆν μηκέτι (*om.* μηκέτι 𝔏g) *cett.* (*lectiones conflat. vg.*a) ἀκούσας δὲ

Καισάρειαν οὗ **ἐφυλάσσετο· οἵτινες ἐλθόντες** ἐβόων ἵνα ἀρθῇ
ἐκ τῆς ζωῆς. **ἀκούσας δὲ ἀμφοτέρων** κατελαβόμην ἐν μηδενὶ
αὐτὸν ἔνοχον εἶναι θανάτου· **εἰπόντος δέ μου· Θέλεις κρίνεσθαι**
μετ' αὐτῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις; Καίσαρα ἐπεκαλέσατο· 26 περὶ
οὗ ἀσφαλές τι γράψαι τῷ κυρίῳ οὐκ ἔχω· διὸ προήγαγον αὐτὸν
ἐφ' ὑμῶν καὶ μάλιστα ἐπὶ σοῦ, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, ὅπως τῆς
ἀνακρίσεως γενομένης σχῶ τί γράψω· 27 ἄλογον γάρ μοι
δοκεῖ πέμποντα δέσμιον μὴ καὶ τὰς κατ' αὐτοῦ αἰτίας σημᾶναι.

XXVI

1 Ἀγρίππας δὲ πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον ἔφη· Ἐπιτρέπεταί σοι ὑπὲρ
σεαυτοῦ λέγειν. τότε ὁ Παῦλος **θαρρῶν καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ**
παράκλησιν λαβὼν ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἀπελογεῖτο· 2 Περὶ
πάντων ὧν ἐγκαλοῦμαι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, ἥγημαι
ἐμαυτὸν μακάριον ἐπὶ σοῦ μέλλων ἀπολογεῖσθαι σήμερον,
3 μάλιστα γνώστην ὄντα σε πάντων τῶν κατὰ Ἰουδαίους
ἐθῶν τε καὶ ζητημάτων ἐπιστάμενος· διὸ δέομαι μακροθύμως
ἀκοῦσαί μου. 4 τὴν μὲν οὖν βίωσίν μου τὴν ἐκ νεότητος,
τὴν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γενομένην ἐν τῷ ἔθνει μου ἔν τε Ἱεροσολύμοις

ἀμφοτέρων *c. Th.* : *om. cett.* κατελαβόμην *c. Th.* : ἐγὼ δὲ κατελαβόμην (καταλαβόμενος ℵ δ, 𝔏^{gs}, 𝔖^{ph}) *cett.* ἐν μηδενὶ αὐτὸν ἔνοχον εἶναι θανάτου *c. Th.* : μηδὲν ἄξιον αὐτὸν θαν. πεπραχέναι *cett.* εἰπόντος δέ . . . ἐπεκαλέσατο *c. Th.* : αὐτοῦ δὲ (καὶ αὐτοῦ δέ 383, 𝔖^{ph}, *Chr.*) τούτου (τοῦ Παύλου *B*) ἐπικαλεσαμένου τὸν Σεβαστὸν ἔκρινα πέμπειν (+ αὐτόν *E* δ) *cett.* 26 ἀσφαλές τι . . . ἔχω] quid certum scribam domino non invenio (habeo *vg.*) 𝔏^{g} *vg.* τῷ κυρίῳ] + μου 𝔖^{ph} : *om.* 𝔖^{vg} προήγαγον *cett.* (𝔏^{e}) : προσήγαγον *E* : ἐπήγαγον *A* Ἀγρίππα *om.* 𝔏^{g} κρίσεως *E* σχῶ ℵ *BC* 383 : ἔχω *AE* 614 γράψω Γ 614 : γράψαι *E* 383 27 μὴ καί . . . σημᾶναι *cett.* : καί . . . μὴ σημᾶναι *E*, 𝔏^{gs} *vg.* XXVI 1 ἐπιτρέπεται] ἐπιτέτραπται 614 : + γάρ 𝔏^{g} ὑπέρ *B* 383 : περί ℵ *ACE* θαρρῶν . . . λαβών *c. Th.* : *om. cett.* τὴν χεῖρα ἐκτείνας δ, 𝔖^{ph} ἀπελογεῖτο] + εἰπών 𝔖^{vg} : coepit rationem reddere dicens (*om.* dicens *vg.*) 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, *Bl.* 2–3 ὧν . . . σε πάντων *om.* 614 2 σήμερον *post* ἀπολογ. *hab.* *E* 383, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈 ; *ante* ἀπολογ. Γ, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. Amb. Chr.* $\tfrac{1}{2}$ 3 πάντων *om.* *A*, 𝔏^{g} τῶν κατὰ Ἰουδαίους (-ων *AE*) *hoc loco hab. cett.*, *post* ζητημ. 𝔏^{g} ζητημάτων] sectam et quaestiones legis 𝔏^{g} ἐπιστάμενος *AC* 614, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett. Hier.* δέομαι] + σου *C* δ, 𝔈 4 τὴν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς *ante* τὴν ἐκ νεότ. *hab.* *E* : *om.* 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈, *Chr.* $\tfrac{1}{2}$ ἔν τε] ἐν *C* δ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}

ἴσασιν πάντες Ἰουδαῖοι, 5 προγινώσκοντές με ἄνωθεν, ἐὰν
θέλωσιν μαρτυρεῖν, ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν τῆς
ἡμετέρας θρησκείας ἔζησα Φαρισαῖος· 6 καὶ νῦν ἐπ᾽ ἐλπίδι
τῆς εἰς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν ἐπαγγελίας γενομένης ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ
ἕστηκα κρινόμενος, 7 εἰς ἣν τὸ δωδεκάφυλον ἡμῶν ἐν
ἐκτενείᾳ νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν λατρεῦον ἐλπίζει καταντῆσαι· περὶ
ἧς ἐλπίδος ἐγκαλοῦμαι, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων.
8 τί ἄπιστον κρίνεται παρ᾽ ὑμῖν εἰ ὁ Θεὸς νεκροὺς ἐγείρει;
9 ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ἔδοξα ἐμαυτῷ πρὸς τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζω-
ραίου δεῖν πολλὰ ἐναντία πρᾶξαι, 10 ὃ καὶ ἐποίησα ἐν
Ἱεροσολύμοις, και πολλοὺς τῶν ἁγίων ἐγὼ ἐν φυλακαῖς κατ-
έκλεισα τὴν παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων ἐξουσίαν λαβών, ἀναιρου-
μένων τε αὐτῶν κατήνεγκα ψῆφον, 11 καὶ κατὰ πάσας τὰς
συναγωγὰς πολλάκις τιμωρῶν αὐτοὺς ἠνάγκαζον βλασφημεῖν,
περισσῶς τε ἐμμαινόμενος αὐτοῖς ἐδίωκον ἕως καὶ εἰς τὰς ἔξω
πόλεις. 12 ἐν οἷς πορευόμενος εἰς τὴν Δαμασκὸν μετ᾽
ἐξουσίας καὶ ἐπιτροπῆς τῆς τῶν ἀρχιερέων, 13 ἡμέρας
μέσης κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν εἶδον, βασιλεῦ, οὐρανόθεν ὑπὲρ τὴν
λαμπρότητα τοῦ ἡλίου περίλαμψάν με φῶς καὶ τοὺς σὺν ἐμοὶ
πορευομένους· 14 πάντων τε καταπεσόντων ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν
γῆν **διὰ τὸν φόβον ἐγὼ μόνος** ἤκουσα φωνὴν λέγουσαν πρός με

4 οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ℵ *A* 383 5 ἔζησα] semper vixi 𝔏g 6 εἰς] πρός *C* δ, *Chr.* ἡμῶν *om.* 383, *Bl.* γενομένης ἐπαγγ. 614, 𝔏g, *Chr.* 7 ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ *om. vg.* λατρεῦον ἐλπίζει (-ειν *E* 383 *m.* 2) *cett.* : λατρεύει ἐν ἐλπίδι 𝔏g (*voc.* ἐλπίδι *firmat pap. Oxy.* 1597) καταντήσειν *B* νῦν ἐγκαλοῦμαι 𝔏g βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα *ante* ὑπό *hab.* δ, 𝔖, *Chr.* : βασιλεῦ *post* Ἰουδαίων ℵ *BCE*, *post* ἐλπίδος 𝔈 : *om. A*, 𝔏g *vg.* 9 ἐναντία] + με 𝔖ph 10 καὶ πολλούς *B* δ : καὶ πολλούς τε *cett.* τῶν ἁγίων] sanctos 𝔏g ἐξουσίαν λαβών *ante* παρά *hab.* 𝔏g αὐτῶν *om. E* 11 βλασφημεῖν] + τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (Ἰησοῦ 𝔖vg) *vg.*aqw, 𝔖vg 12 τήν *om. AE* 614 ἐπιτροπῆς] provocatione 𝔏g τῆς τῶν ℵ *B* 614 : τῶν *AE* : τῆς παρὰ τῶν *C* 383, *Chr.* 13 ὦ βασιλεῦ *vg.*w (*mg.*), 𝔖, *Bl.* οὐρανόθεν . . . φῶς] de caelo splendorem solis circumfulsisse me luce 𝔏g 14 ἡμῶν *om. B* διὰ τὸν φόβον *post* εἰς τὴν γῆν *hab.* 614, 𝔏g, *ante* εἰς τὴν γῆν *c. Th.* : *om. cett.* ἐγὼ μόνος *c. Th.* 614 : *om. cett.* φωνὴν (-ῆς *E*) λέγουσαν (-σης *E*) πρός με *cett.* : φωνὴν λαλοῦσαν πρός με καὶ λέγουσαν δ, 𝔏g, *Chr.* Σαῦλε, Σαῦλε *E* 15 ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπα . . . ὁ δὲ κύριος εἶπεν *om.* 𝔏g ὁ δὲ κύριος εἶπεν] + πρός με *E*, 𝔖vg ἐγώ] + γάρ 𝔏g ὁ Ναζωραῖος 614, 𝔏g *vg.*q, 𝔖 : *om. cett.* ὃν σὺ διώκεις

τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ· Σαούλ, Σαούλ, τί με διώκεις; σκληρόν
σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν. 15 ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπα· Τίς εἶ, Κύριε;
ὁ δὲ Κύριος εἶπεν· Ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὁ **Ναζωραῖος** ὃν σὺ
διώκεις. 16 ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι καὶ στῆθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου·
εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὤφθην σοι, προχειρίσασθαί σε ὑπηρέτην καὶ
μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδες ὧν τε ὀφθήσομαί σοι, 17 ἐξαιρούμενός
σε ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν, εἰς οὓς ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε,
18 ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν, τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς
φῶς καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν, τοῦ λαβεῖν
αὐτοὺς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ κλῆρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πίστει
τῇ εἰς ἐμέ. 19 ὅθεν, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, οὐκ ἐγενόμην
ἀπειθὴς τῇ οὐρανίῳ ὀπτασίᾳ, 20 ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐν Δαμασκῷ
πρῶτον καὶ **τοῖς** ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, **εἰς** πᾶσάν τε τὴν χώραν τῆς
Ἰουδαίας, καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐκήρυξα μετανοεῖν καὶ ἐπιστρέφειν
ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν, ἄξια τῆς μετανοίας ἔργα πράσσοντας. 21 ἕνεκα
τούτων οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι συλλαβόμενοί με ὄντα ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐπειρῶντο
διαχειρίσασθαι. 22 ἐπικουρίας οὖν τυχὼν τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ
ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης ἕστηκα μαρτυρόμενος μικρῷ τε καὶ
μεγάλῳ, οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λέγων ὧν οἱ προφῆται ἐλάλησαν μελλόν-
των γίνεσθαι· **γέγραπται γὰρ** ἐν Μωσῇ, 23 εἰ παθητὸς ὁ
Χριστός, εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν φῶς μέλλει καταγ-

om. 𝔏^{g} 16 καὶ στῆθι *om.* *B* εἶδες] + με *BC*^{1} 614, 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug.* 17 καὶ ἐξαιρούμενος 𝔏^{g} καὶ ἐκ τῶν] καὶ τῶν *C* δ, *Chr.* ἀποστελῶ 614 18 αὐτῶν *cett. Clem.*: τῶν τυφλῶν *E*, *Aug.* (*Trin.* xiii. 19) εἰς φῶς *om.* 𝔏^{g} καὶ (*om.* 𝔏^{g}) ἀπό *CE* 614, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}, *Aug.*: καί ℵ *AB* 383, *Clem.* ἡγιασμένοις *cett. Clem. Aug.*: + πᾶσιν *E* 19 ὅθεν *om.* 𝔏^{g} 20 πρῶτον *E* δ: πρῶτόν τε Γ καὶ τοῖς ἐν 614, 𝔖^{ph}: καὶ ἐν *AE*, 𝔏^{g}: καί ℵ *B* 383 εἰς *E* δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖: *om.* Γ τὴν χώραν τῆς Ἰουδαίας] χώραν Ἰουδαίοις (Iudaeis 𝔏^{p2}) *Bl.* ἔθνεσιν] civitatibus 𝔏^{h} ἐκήρυξα *pap. Oxy.*, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖: ἀπήγγελλον (ἀπαγγέλλω 383) *cett.* θεόν] + τὸν ζῶντα *vg.*^{qw} ἄξια] + τε *E*, 𝔖^{vg} ἔργα τῆς μετανοίας 𝔏^{h} 21 οἱ (*om.* 614) Ἰουδαῖοι συλλαβ. με *A* 614, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph}: οἱ Ἰουδ. με συλλαβ. *E*, *Chr.*: με Ἰουδ. συλλαβ. ℵ *BC* 383 (με Ἰουδ. ὄντα ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ συλλαβ. 𝔏^{h}) ὄντα *om.* *AB* 383 22 ἐπικουρίας . . . θεοῦ] cum ergo auxilium dei si . . . . (-m consecutus *suppl. Souter*) 𝔏^{h} ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης *post* ἕστηκα *hab.* 𝔏^{g}, *om.* 𝔏^{h} μικρῷ τε καὶ μεγάλῳ *cett. Amb.*: maiori ac minori 𝔏^{h} ὧν 𝔏^{gh} *Bl.*: ὧν τε *cett.* γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν Μωσῇ 𝔏^{gh}, *Tert.Ambst.*: καὶ Μωσῆς *cett.* (*lac. post* γέγρ. γὰρ ἐν Μ. *statuit Bl.*) 23 εἰ πρῶτος *om.* 𝔏^{h} φῶς μέλλει καταγγέλλειν] lux annuntiabit 𝔏^{h}

γέλλειν τῷ τε λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. 24 ταῦτα δὲ **λαλοῦντος**
αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπολογουμένου ὁ Φῆστος μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ φησίν·
Μαίνῃ, Παῦλε, μαίνῃ· τὰ πολλά σε γράμματα εἰς μανίαν
περιτρέπει. 25 ὁ δὲ Παῦλος· Οὐ μαίνομαι, φησίν, κράτιστε
ἡγεμών, ἀλλ' ἀληθείας καὶ σωφροσύνης ῥήματα ἀποφθέγγομαι.
26 ἐπίσταται γὰρ περὶ τούτων ὁ βασιλεύς, πρὸς ὃν καὶ παρρη-
σιαζόμενος λαλῶ· λανθάνειν γὰρ αὐτόν τι τούτων οὐ πείθομαι
οὐδέν, οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἐν γωνίᾳ πεπραγμένον τοῦτο· 27 πιστεύ-
εις, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, τοῖς προφήταις; οἶδα ὅτι πιστεύεις.
28 ὁ δὲ Ἀγρίππας πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον· Ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθῃ
Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι. 29 ὁ δὲ Παῦλος· Εὐξαίμην ἂν τῷ
Θεῷ καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ καὶ ἐν μεγάλῳ οὐ μόνον σὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντας
τοὺς ἀκούοντάς μου σήμερον γενέσθαι τοιούτους ὁποῖος κἀγώ
εἰμι παρεκτὸς τῶν δεσμῶν τούτων. 30 **καὶ ταῦτα εἰπόντος**
αὐτοῦ ἀνέστη ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ ἡγεμὼν ἥ τε Βερνίκη καὶ οἱ
συγκαθήμενοι αὐτοῖς, 31 καὶ ἀναχωρήσαντες ἐλάλουν πρὸς
ἀλλήλους λέγοντες ὅτι Οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἢ δεσμῶν πράσσει

24 λαλοῦντος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπολογουμένου *E*, 𝔏g : et cum haec lo[quere]tur 𝔏h : αὐτοῦ ἀπολογουμένου *cett.* ὁ Φῆστος . . . φησίν] oravit exclamavit (*sec. Buch.*, et clamavit *sec. Berg.*) Festus et dixit 𝔏h μαίνῃ, Παῦλε, μαίνῃ *Hier.*: insanis[ti Paule] insanisti (ἐμάνης Π. ἐμάνης *Bl.*) 𝔏h, *Bl.* : μαίνῃ, Παῦλε *cett.* περιτρέπει] conu . . . . 𝔏h : περιέτρεψεν *Bl.* 25 ὁ δὲ Παῦλος Γ *E*, *vg.* : ἔφη αὐτῷ Παῦλος 𝔖vg : ὁ δέ δ, 𝔏gh, 𝔖ph : ὁ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ 𝔏h, *Bl.* ἡγεμών 𝔏gh : Φῆστε *cett.* 26 ἐπίσταται γὰρ περὶ τούτων] scit aute [. . . . . .] de istis 𝔏h : omnibus *post* autem *suppl. Buch.* καὶ παρρησιαζόμενος *om.* 𝔏h (καί *om.* *B*, *vg.*[a]) λανθάνειν . . . οὐδέν] nihil enim hor[. . . . .] latet 𝔏h οὐ (οὐδέν *E*) γάρ . . . τοῦτο *om.* 𝔏h, *del. Bl.* 27 ὅτι *om.* 𝔏g 28 πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον] πρὸς αὐτόν φησιν 𝔏h, 𝔖vg : πρὸς αὐτόν *Bl.* ἐν *om.* 𝔏h πείθῃ *A* : πείθεις (+Παῦλε 𝔏h) *cett.* Χριστιανόν *AE* δ : Χρηστ. ℵ : Χρειστ. *B* ποιῆσαι *c.Th.* Γ, *Cass.* (𝔏h *lacer est*) : γενέσθαι *E* δ, 𝔏gs *vg.*, 𝔖 29 ὁ δὲ Παῦλος] ὁ δέ 𝔏g : ad quem sic ait 𝔏h, *Bl.* εὐξαίμην] εὐξάμην ℵ : opto 𝔏gs *vg.* πάντας . . . γενέσθαι] istos qui me audiunt omnes fieri 𝔏h, *Bl.* 30 καὶ ταῦτα εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ (*om.* αὐτοῦ 614) ἀνέστη (+δέ 𝔖ph) δ, 𝔏h, 𝔖ph : ἀνέστη τε (τότε ἀνέστη 𝔏s) *cett.* ἥ τε Βερνίκη *om.* 𝔏h καὶ οἱ συγκαθ. αὐτοῖς] et omnes asse- [. . . . .] 𝔏h : -dentes eis *suppl. Berg.*, -ntiebant eis *Buch.* 31 ἀναχωρήσαντες ἐλάλουν] secesserunt praefantes 𝔏h (ἀνεχώρησαν οἱ προειρημένοι *Zahn*) ἀλλήλους] +περὶ αὐτοῦ 𝔏h ἄξιον *ante* θανάτου *hab.* *A* 614, 𝔏g, 𝔖, *post* θανάτου 383, 𝔏h, *post* δεσμῶν ℵ *B*, 𝔏s *vg.* πράσσει ὁ ἄνθρ. οὗτος] homo iste [. . . . . . .] 𝔏h : gessit (fecit *vg.*) 𝔏s *vg.* : homines isti

ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος. 32 Ἀγρίππας δὲ τῷ Φήστῳ ἔφη·
Ἀπολελύσθαι ἐδύνατο ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος εἰ μὴ ἐπεκέκλητο
Καίσαρα.

XXVII

1 **Οὕτως οὖν ἔκρινεν ὁ ἡγεμὼν ἀναπέμπεσθαι αὐτὸν Καίσαρι.
καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον προσκαλεσάμενος** ἑκατοντάρχην τινὰ ὀνόματι
Ἰούλιον, σπείρης Σεβαστῆς, παρεδίδου αὐτῷ τὸν Παῦλον σὺν
καὶ ἑτέροις δεσμώταις. 2 **ἀρξάμενοι δὲ τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν εἰς
τὴν Ἰταλίαν** ἐπέβημεν πλοίῳ Ἀδραμυττηνῷ, μέλλοντι πλεῖν εἰς
τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν τόπους, ἐπέβη δὲ σὺν ἡμῖν καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος
Μακεδὼν Θεσσαλονικεύς. 3 τῇ τε ἑτέρᾳ κατήχθημεν εἰς
Σιδῶνα, φιλανθρώπως τε χρησάμενος τῷ Παύλῳ ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης
ἐπέτρεψεν πρὸς τοὺς φίλους πορευθέντι ἐπιμελείας τυχεῖν.
4 κἀκεῖθεν ἀναχθέντες ὑπεπλεύσαμεν τὴν Κύπρον διὰ τὸ τοὺς
ἀνέμους εἶναι ἐναντίους, 5 καὶ **μετὰ ταῦτα** διαπλεύσαντες
τὸν Κιλίκιον κόλπον καὶ τὸ Παμφύλιον πέλαγος **δι' ἡμερῶν**

faciunt 𝔏^{g} 32 Ἀγρίππας . . . ἔφη *cett.*: [respon]dit autem rex Agrippa 𝔏^{h} XXVII 1 οὕτως οὖν . . . Καίσαρι *c. Th.*, 𝔏^{hp2} *vg.*^{qw}, 𝔖^{vg} (+εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν 𝔖^{vg}): *om. cett.* καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον *c. Th.*, 𝔏^{h}: ὡς δὲ ἐκρίθη (+sequenti die iussit *vg.*^{w}) τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν ἡμᾶς (αὐτόν *vg.*) εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν *cett.*: *om.* 𝔖^{vg} προσκαλεσάμενος . . . Ἰούλιον (Ἰουλιανόν *c. Th.*) σπείρης Σεβαστῆς (σπ. Ἰταλικῆς *post* τινά *hab.* 𝔏^{g}, *om.* 𝔏^{h}) . . . σὺν καὶ (*om.* καί 𝔏^{gh}) ἑτέροις δεσμώταις *c. Th.*, 𝔏^{gh}: παρεδίδουν (-ου *A*, 𝔏^{s}, 𝔖^{vg}) τόν τε Παῦλον καί τινας ἑτέρους (*om.* ἑτέρους 614, 𝔖^{ph}) δεσμώτας ἑκατοντάρχῃ (+τινί 𝔖) ὀνόματι Ἰουλίῳ σπείρης Σεβαστῆς *cett.* 2 ἀρξάμενοι δὲ (*om.* δέ 𝔏^{h}) τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν 𝔏^{gh}, 𝔖^{vg}: *om. cett.* εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν 𝔏^{g}: *om. cett.* ἐπέβημεν 𝔏^{gh}: ἐπιβάντες δέ (*om.* δέ *vg.*) *cett.* μέλλοντι (-τες 383, *vg.*) . . . τόπους *cett.*: *om.* 𝔏^{h} ἐπέβη . . . Θεσσαλονικεύς (*om.* Θεσσ. 𝔏^{h}) 𝔏^{gh} *vg.*, 𝔖: ἀνήχθημεν ὄντος (μένοντος *vg.*) σὺν ἡμῖν Ἀριστάρχου Μακεδόνος Θεσσαλονικέως (Θεσσαλονικέων δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Σεκοῦνδος 614, 𝔖^{ph}, *cf.* xx. 4) *cett.* 3 τῇ δὲ ἑτέρᾳ κατήχθημεν] κατήχθημεν δέ 𝔏^{h} χρησάμενος τῷ Παύλῳ ὁ ἑκατοντ. 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg}: χρησ. Ἰούλιος ὁ ἑκατοντ. (*om.* ὁ ἑκατοντ. 𝔏^{s} *vg.*) τῷ Παύλῳ 𝔏^{gs} *vg.*: ὁ Ἰούλιος (Ἰουλιανός *A*) τῷ Π. χρησ. *cett.* ἐπέτρεψεν . . . τυχεῖν *cett.* *Cass.*: permisit amicis qui veniebant [ad eum] uti curam eius agerent 𝔏^{h}, *Bl.* 4 ἐκεῖθεν δέ 𝔏^{h} 5 καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα διαπλεύσαντες τὸν Κιλίκιον κόλπον καὶ τὸ Παμφύλιον πέλαγος 𝔏^{h}: τό τε (τότε 𝔖^{ph}) πέλαγος τὸ κατὰ τὴν Κιλικίαν καὶ Παμφυλίαν διαπλεύσαντες (διαπλ. *ante* τό τε *hab.* 𝔏^{g}) *cett.* δι' ἡμερῶν δεκαπέντε 614, 𝔏^{h} *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖^{ph}: *om. cett.*

δεκαπέντε *κατήλθομεν εἰς* Μύρα *τῆς* Λυκίας. 6 *κἀκεῖ εὑρὼν*
ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης πλοῖον Ἀλεξανδρῖνον *πλέον εἰς τὴν* Ἰταλίαν
ἐνεβίβασεν ἡμᾶς εἰς αὐτό. 7 *ἐν ἱκαναῖς δὲ ἡμέραις*
βραδυπλοοῦντες καὶ μόλις γενόμενοι κατὰ τὴν Κνίδον, *μὴ*
προσεῶντος ἡμᾶς τοῦ ἀνέμου, ὑπεπλεύσαμεν τὴν Κρήτην *κατὰ*
Σαλμώνην· 8 *μόλις τε παραλεγόμενοι αὐτὴν ἤλθομεν εἰς*
τόπον τινὰ καλούμενον Καλοὺς Λιμένας, *ᾧ ἐγγὺς ἦν πόλις*
Λασαία. 9 *ἱκανοῦ δὲ χρόνου διαγενομένου καὶ ὄντος ἤδη*
ἐπισφαλοῦς τοῦ πλοὸς διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν νηστείαν ἤδη παρεληλυ-
θέναι, παρῄνει ὁ Παῦλος 10 *λέγων αὐτοῖς·* Ἄνδρες, *θεωρῶ*
ὅτι μετὰ ὕβρεως καὶ πολλῆς ζημίας, οὐ μόνον τοῦ φορτίου καὶ
τοῦ πλοίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν, μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι τὸν
πλοῦν. 11 *ὁ δὲ ἑκατοντάρχης τῷ κυβερνήτῃ καὶ τῷ*
ναυκλήρῳ μᾶλλον ἐπείθετο ἢ τοῖς ὑπὸ Παύλου *λεγομένοις.*
12 *ἀνευθέτου δὲ τοῦ λιμένος ὑπάρχοντος πρὸς παραχειμασίαν*
οἱ πλείονες ἔθεντο βουλὴν ἀναχθῆναι ἐκεῖθεν, εἴ πως δύναιντο
καταντήσαντες εἰς Φοίνικα *παραχειμάσαι, λιμένα τῆς* Κρήτης
βλέποντα κατὰ λίβα καὶ κατὰ χῶρον. 13 *ὑποπνεύσαντος*
δὲ νότου δόξαντες τῆς προθέσεως κεκρατηκέναι ἄραντες ἆσσον

5 Μύρα δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}$: Μύρρα *B*, $\mathfrak{E}$: Σμύρνα *cod. Bedae* (? *E*) : Λύστραν ℵ *A*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gs}$ *vg.*, *Cass.* 6 κἀκεῖ] καί $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ ὁ ἑκατοντ. *post* Ἀλεξ. *hab.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ εἰς αὐτό *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Bl.* 7 ἐν ἱκαναῖς . . . βραδυπλοοῦντες] et cum tarde navigaremus per aliquos [dies] $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ μόλις *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ κατὰ τὴν Κνίδον *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{s}$ μὴ . . . ἀνέμου *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ προεῶντος *Bl.* ὑπεπλεύσαμεν . . . ἤλθομεν (*v.* 8)] et inde cum tulissemus lege[. . . . .]en devenimus $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ (-ntes Cret- *suppl. Buch.*) κατὰ Σαλμώνην *om.* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ 8 εἰς . . . Λιμένας] in Portum Bonum $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ ᾧ ἐγγύς] ubi anchis (= ἄγχι ?) $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ πόλις ἦν ℵ *A*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ Λασαία δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Chr.* : Λασέα *B* : Λασσαία ℵ : Ἄλασσα (-ασα *c.Th.*) *A c.Th.* : Talassa (Thal. *vg.*) $\mathfrak{L}^{gs}$ *vg.* : *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ 9 ἱκανοῦ . . . διαγενομένου] et cum paucos (plures *Buch.*) dies illic fecissemus $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ καὶ ὄντος . . . πλοός *post* παρεληλυθέναι *hab.* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ νηστείαν ἤδη] νηστείαν $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$ παρῄνει] προσῆλθεν $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ αὐτοῖς] αὐτούς (*post* παρῄνει) $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*[a], *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ 10 θεωρῶ . . . ζημίας] video nos cum iniuria [. . . . . .]t iactura $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ τοῦ φορτίου καί *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ 11–12 ὁ δέ . . . Κρήτης] gubernator autem [et magis]ter navis cogitabant si forte possent [venire P]hoenicem in portum qui est Cretae. Consen[tiebat i]llis magis centurio quam Pauli verbis $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ (*turbato ordine et om.* ἀνευθέτου δέ . . . οἱ πλείονες) *Bl.* 11 ἐπείθετο μᾶλλον δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ (*om.* μᾶλλον $\mathfrak{L}^{s}$) 12 κἀκεῖθεν $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ βλέποντα . . . χῶρον *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: καὶ κατὰ χῶρον *om.* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ 13 δέ] καί $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ νότου] εὔρου

παρελέγοντο τὴν Κρήτην. 14 μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ἔβαλεν κατ'
αὐτῆς ἄνεμος τυφωνικὸς ὁ καλούμενος εὐρακύλων· 15 συναρ-
πασθέντος δὲ τοῦ πλοίου καὶ μὴ δυναμένου ἀντοφθαλμεῖν τῷ
ἀνέμῳ, ἐπιδόντες τῷ **πνέοντι καὶ συστείλαντες τὰ ἱστία** ἐφερό-
μεθα. 16 νησίον δέ τι ὑποδραμόντες καλούμενον Καῦδα
ἰσχύσαμεν μόλις περικρατεῖς γενέσθαι τῆς σκάφης, 17 ἣν
ἄραντες βοηθείαις ἐχρῶντο ὑποζωννύντες τὸ πλοῖον· φοβούμενοί
τε μὴ εἰς τὴν σύρτιν ἐκπέσωσιν, χαλάσαντες τὸ σκεῦος οὕτως
ἐφέροντο. 18 σφοδρῶς δὲ χειμαζομένων ἡμῶν τῇ ἑξῆς
ἐκβολὴν ἐποιοῦντο· 19 καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ αὐτόχειρες τὴν
σκευὴν τοῦ πλοίου ἔρριψαν **εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.** 20 μήτε δὲ
ἡλίου μήτε ἄστρων ἐπιφαινόντων ἐπὶ πλείονας ἡμέρας, χειμῶ-
νός τε οὐκ ὀλίγου ἐπικειμένου, λοιπὸν περιῃρεῖτο πᾶσα ἐλπὶς
τοῦ σώζεσθαι ἡμᾶς. 21 πολλῆς τε ἀσιτίας ὑπαρχούσης
τότε σταθεὶς ὁ Παῦλος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν εἶπεν· Ἔδει μέν, ὦ ἄνδρες,
πειθαρχήσαντάς μοι μὴ ἀνάγεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς Κρήτης κερδῆσαί
τε τὴν ὕβριν ταύτην καὶ τὴν ζημίαν. 22 καὶ τὰ νῦν παραινῶ
ὑμᾶς εὐθυμεῖν, ἀποβολὴ γὰρ ψυχῆς οὐδεμία ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν,
πλὴν τοῦ πλοίου. 23 παρέστη γάρ μοι ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ

𝔏[g] δόξαντες ... κεκρατηκέναι *om.* 𝔏[h] ἆσσον] Ἄσσον 𝔏[s] *vg.*: θᾶσσον 𝔏[h], *Bl.*: Ἄλασον 𝔈 (ἄραντες ἆσσον *om.* 𝔖[vg]) παρελεγόμεθα 𝔏[h], 𝔖[vg] 14 μετ' οὐ ... κατ' αὐτῆς] descendit autem 𝔏[s] εὐρακύλων] εὐροκλύδων (εὐρα- 𝔖[ph]) δ, 𝔖, *Chr.* 15 τῷ πνέοντι (πλέ. 614), 614, *vg.*, 𝔖[ph]: *om. cett.* καί ... ἱστία *cod. Bedae* (? *E*), 614, 𝔖[ph], *Cass.*: *om. cett.* ἐφερόμεθα] κατὰ τὸ τυχὸν ἐφερόμεθα 𝔖[ph]: *om.* 𝔏[g] 16 Καῦδα *B*, 𝔏[gs] *vg.*: Κλαῦδα (Καυρα 𝔖[vg]) *cett.*: Gaude *Cass. Cf. Plin. N.H.* iv. 61 Gaudos: *Suid.* Καυδώ: *Ptol.* Κλαῦδος μόλις ἰσχύσαμεν δ, 𝔏[gs], 𝔖 17 ἐχρώμεθα 𝔏[gs] *vg.*[a], 𝔖[vg] ἐκπέσωσιν *cett.* (𝔏[s]): ἐκπέσωμεν 𝔏[g] ἐχάλασαν 𝔏[g] τὸ σκεῦος] τὰ ἱστία 𝔏[s], 𝔖[vg], *Chr.*: vas quoddam quod traheret 𝔏[g] οὕτως ἐφέροντο (-όμεθα 𝔖[vg]) *cett.*: *om.* 𝔏[g]: οὕτως *om.* 𝔏[s] 18 σφοδρῶς . . . ἡμῶν] vento autem valide instante et tempestate 𝔏[g] ἐποιησάμεθα (+εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν) 𝔖[vg] 19 ἐρρίψαμεν δ, 𝔖, *Chr.* εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν 614, 𝔏[gs] *vg.*[w], 𝔖[ph], 𝔈: *om. cett.* 20 χειμῶνός τε ... ἐπικειμένου *ante* καὶ μήτε ἡλίου *hab.* 𝔏[g], 𝔖[vg] (*fere*), *Bl.* λοιπόν *om.* *B*, 𝔏[g], 𝔖, *Bl.* τοῦ σώζεσθαι ἡμᾶς] vitae 𝔏[g] 21 πολλῆς . . ὑπαρχούσης] et cum multis diebus iam ieiunassent 𝔏[g] τότε *om.* *A*, 𝔏[g] μέν] +ὑμᾶς 𝔏[gs] *vg.*[a] 22 τὰ νῦν] +μέν 𝔏[gs] οὐδεμιᾶς ψυχῆς 𝔏[gs] *vg.*, 𝔖[ph] πλήν] +μόνον 𝔏[gs] 23 γάρ *om.* 𝔏[g]

ἄγγελος τοῦ Θεοῦ οὗ εἰμι, ᾧ καὶ λατρεύω, λέγων· 24 Μὴ
φοβοῦ, Παῦλε· Καίσαρί σε δεῖ παραστῆναι, καὶ ἰδοὺ κεχάρισταί
σοι ὁ Θεὸς πάντας τοὺς πλέοντας μετὰ σοῦ. 25 διὸ εὐθυμεῖτε,
ἄνδρες· πιστεύω γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ ὅτι οὕτως ἔσται καθ' ὃν τρόπον
λελάληταί μοι. 26 εἰς νῆσον δέ τινα δεῖ ἡμᾶς ἐκπεσεῖν.
27 ὡς δὲ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτη νὺξ ἐγένετο διαφερομένων ἡμῶν
ἐν τῷ Ἀδρίᾳ, κατὰ μέσον τῆς νυκτὸς ὑπενόουν οἱ ναῦται
προσαχεῖν τινὰ αὐτοῖς χώραν. 28 καὶ βολίσαντες εὗρον
ὀργυιὰς εἴκοσι, βραχὺ δὲ διαστήσαντες καὶ πάλιν βολί-
σαντες εὗρον ὀργυιὰς δεκαπέντε. 29 φοβούμενοι δὲ μήπου
κατὰ τραχεῖς τόπους ἐκπέσωμεν, ἐκ πρύμνης ῥίψαντες
ἀγκύρας τέσσαρας εὔχοντο ἡμέραν γενέσθαι. 30 τῶν δὲ
ναυτῶν ζητούντων φυγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου καὶ χαλασάντων
τὴν σκάφην εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, προφάσει ὡς ἐκ πρῴρας
ἀγκύρας μελλόντων ἐκτείνειν, **τοῦ ἀσφαλέστερον τὸ πλοῖον
ἑστάναι,** 31 εἶπεν ὁ Παῦλος τῷ ἑκατοντάρχῃ καὶ τοῖς
στρατιώταις· Ἐὰν μὴ οὗτοι ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ μείνωσιν, ὑμεῖς
σωθῆναι οὐ δύνασθε. 32 τότε ἀπέκοψαν οἱ στρατιῶται τὰ
σχοινία τῆς σκάφης καὶ εἴασαν αὐτὴν ἐκπεσεῖν. 33 ἄχρι
δὲ οὗ ἡμέρα ἤμελλεν γίνεσθαι παρεκάλει ὁ Παῦλος ἅπαν-

23 ἄγγελος *ante* τοῦ θεοῦ *hab.* 383, 𝔏gs *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈, *ante* λέγων Γ 614 οὗ εἰμι (+ἐγώ ℵ *A*, *vg.*), ᾧ καί *cett.* (𝔏s) : ᾧ 𝔏g 24 ὁ θεός *om.* 𝔏g 25 λελάληταί μοι] locutus est 𝔏g 27 ἐπεγένετο *A*, *vg.* προσαχεῖν (resonare) *B*, 𝔏gs : προσάγειν *AC* 383 : προσαγαγεῖν ℵ : προσεγγίζειν 614 28 καί] οἵτινες ℵ, *vg.* εἴκοσι] +τὸ βάθος 𝔏gs *vg.*q διαστήσαντες καί *om.* 𝔏gs καὶ πάλιν βολίσαντες *om.* *vg.*, 𝔖vg 29 δέ] τε *AB* 383 μήπου (*ex* μή ℵ) ℵ *BC*: μήπω *A* : μήπως δ ἐμπέσωμεν ℵ γενέσθαι *cett.* (𝔏s): +ut sciremus an salvi esse possimus 𝔏g, *Bl.* 30 προφάσει] occasionem quaerentes 𝔏s : sub obtentu *vg.*: occasionem quaerentes sub obtentu (*duabus lectt. conflatis*) 𝔏g, *Bl.* τοῦ ἀσφαλέστερον τὸ πλοῖον ἑστάναι 𝔏g : et ligaturi navem in terra 𝔖vg : *om. cett.* 31 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Παῦλος εἶπεν 𝔖vg ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ μείνωσιν ℵ 614, 𝔏gs *vg.*, 𝔖: μείν. ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ *ABC* 383, 𝔈 ὑμεῖς . . . δύνασθε] ἡμεῖς . . . δυνάμεθα 𝔏g 32 τότε] +εὐθέως 𝔏gs τῆς σκάφης *cett.* (𝔏s): καὶ τὴν σκάφην 𝔏g, *Bl.* καὶ εἴασαν] εἴασαν 𝔏g, *Bl.* 33 σήμερον . . . προσλαβόμενοι] dies est hodie a qua sine cibo manetis 𝔏g, 𝔖vg (*fere*) 34 διό] +καί *B*, 𝔏g τροφῆς] τι τροφῆς ℵ: τινὸς τροφῆς 614, 𝔖ph ἡμετέρας *A* 614, 𝔖ph (τοῦτο γάρ *et*

τας μεταλαβεῖν τροφῆς λέγων· Τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτην σήμε-
ρον ἡμέραν προσδοκῶντες ἄσιτοι διατελεῖτε μηδὲν προσ-
λαβόμενοι. 34 διὸ παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς μεταλαβεῖν τροφῆς·
τοῦτο γὰρ πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας ὑπάρχει· **ἐλπίζω γὰρ**
ἐν τῷ Θεῷ μου ὅτι οὐδενὸς ὑμῶν θρὶξ ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς πεσεῖται.
35 εἴπας δὲ ταῦτα καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαρίστησεν τῷ Θεῷ
ἐνώπιον πάντων καὶ κλάσας ἤρξατο ἐσθίειν **ἐπιδιδοὺς καὶ**
ἡμῖν. 36 εὔθυμοι δὲ γενόμενοι πάντες καὶ αὐτοὶ προσελά-
βοντο τροφῆς. 37 ἤμεθα δὲ αἱ πᾶσαι ψυχαὶ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ
διακόσιαι ἑβδομήκοντα ἕξ. 38 κορεσθέντες δὲ τροφῆς
ἐκούφιζον τὸ πλοῖον ἐκβαλλόμενοι τὸν σῖτον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.
39 ὅτε δὲ ἡμέρα ἐγένετο, τὴν γῆν οὐκ ἐπεγίνωσκον, κόλπον δέ
τινα κατενόουν ἔχοντα αἰγιαλόν, εἰς ὃν ἐβουλεύοντο, εἰ δύναιντο,
ἐξῶσαι τὸ πλοῖον. 40 καὶ τὰς ἀγκύρας περιελόντες εἴων
εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἅμα ἀνέντες τὰς ζευκτηρίας τῶν πηδαλίων,
καὶ ἐπάραντες τὸν ἀρτέμωνα τῇ πνεούσῃ κατεῖχον εἰς τὸν
αἰγιαλόν. 41 περιπεσόντες δὲ εἰς τόπον διθάλασσον
ἐπέκειλαν τὴν ναῦν, καὶ ἡ μὲν πρῷρα ἐρείσασα ἔμεινεν
ἀσάλευτος, ἡ δὲ πρύμνα ἐλύετο ὑπὸ τῆς βίας **τῶν κυμάτων.**
42 τῶν δὲ στρατιωτῶν βουλὴ ἐγένετο ἵνα τοὺς δεσμώτας

ὑπάρχει *om. vg.*, 𝔖vg) ἐλπίζω γὰρ ἐν τῷ θεῷ μου 𝔏g: *om. cett.* ὅτι οὐδενός 𝔏g: οὐδενὸς γάρ *cett.* ἀπό *ABC*, ἐκ ℵ 383: *om.* 614, *Chr.* πεσεῖται δ, 𝔏g, 𝔖ph, ℭ: ἀπολεῖται Γ, *vg.*, 𝔖vg 35 καὶ ταῦτα εἴπας λαβών 𝔏g *vg.* ἐπιδιδοὺς καὶ ἡμῖν 614, 𝔖ph, ℭ (ut alios exemplo suo potius invitaret, panem frangens ipse cibatus est *Cass.*): *om. cett.* 36 εὔθυμοι δέ] τότε εὔθυμοι 𝔏g καὶ αὐτοί *om.* 𝔏g, 𝔖vg μετελάμβανον 614 37 ἤμεθα ℵ *AB*: ἦμεν *C* δ αἱ πᾶσαι ψυχαὶ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ (ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ *ante* αἱ *hab.* δ, 𝔖ph) *cett.*: οἱ πάντες 𝔏g, *Bl.* διακόσιαι ἑβδομήκοντα ἕξ (= σʹ οʹ ϛʹ) *cett. Cass.*: ὡς ἑβδομήκοντα ἕξ (= ὡς οʹ ϛʹ) *B*, ℭ 39 ἐγένετο] + οἱ ναῦται 𝔏g, 𝔖vg, ℭ ἐγίνωσκον *B* 614 ἐβουλεύοντο ℵ *BC*: ἐβούλοντο *A*: ἐβουλήσαντο δ, *Chr.* δύναιντο] δυνατόν *C* 383, 𝔖vg, *Chr.* ἐξῶσαι] ἐκσῶσαι *BC*, ℭ 41 ναῦν] + ὅπου ἡ σύρτις 𝔖ph (*ex v.* 17): + εἰς σύρτιν *Bl.* ἐρείσασα *om.* 𝔏g, ℭ τῶν κυμάτων (maris 𝔏g *vg.*) *C* δ, 𝔏g *vg.*, 𝔖: *om.* ℵ *AB*: τοῦ ἀνέμου τοῦ πνέοντος πρὸς τὸν αἰγιαλόν (*ex v.* 40) ℭ 42 τῶν δέ . . . ἐγένετο] tunc cogitaverunt milites 𝔏g, *Bl.*: milites cogitaverunt *Ambst.* ἵνα] + πάντας 𝔏g, *Bl.*

ἀποκτείνωσιν, μή τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐκκολυμβήσας διαφύγῃ. 43 ὁ
δὲ ἑκατοντάρχης βουλόμενος διασῶσαι τὸν Παῦλον ἐκώλυσεν
αὐτοὺς τοῦ βουλήματος· ἐκέλευσέν τε τοὺς δυναμένους κολυμ-
βᾶν ἀπορρίψαντας πρώτους ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐξιέναι, 44 καὶ
τοὺς λοιποὺς οὓς μὲν ἐπὶ σανίσιν οὓς δὲ ἐπί τινων τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ
πλοίου. καὶ οὕτως ἐγένετο πάντας διασωθῆναι ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

XXVIII

1 Καὶ διασωθέντες τότε ἐπέγνωμεν ὅτι Μελίτη ἡ νῆσος καλεῖται.
2 οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι παρεῖχαν οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν φιλανθρωπίαν
ἡμῖν· ἅψαντες γὰρ πυρὰν προσανελάμβανον πάντας ἡμᾶς διὰ
τὸν ὑετὸν τὸν ἐφεστῶτα καὶ διὰ τὸ ψῦχος. 3 συστρέψαντος δὲ
τοῦ Παύλου φρυγάνων τι πλῆθος καὶ ἐπιθέντος ἐπὶ τὴν πυράν,
ἔχιδνα ἀπὸ τῆς θέρμης ἐξελθοῦσα καθῆψεν τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ.
4 ὡς δὲ εἶδον οἱ βάρβαροι κρεμάμενον τὸ θηρίον ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς
αὐτοῦ, πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔλεγον· Πάντως φονεύς ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος
οὗτος, ὃν διασωθέντα ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ δίκη ζῆν οὐκ εἴασεν.
5 ὁ μὲν οὖν ἀποτινάξας τὸ θηρίον εἰς τὸ πῦρ ἔπαθεν οὐδὲν
κακόν· 6 οἱ δὲ προσεδόκων αὐτὸν μέλλειν ἐμπίμπρασθαι
ἢ καταπίπτειν ἄφνω νεκρόν. ἐπὶ πολὺ δὲ αὐτῶν προσδοκώντων
καὶ θεωρούντων μηδὲν ἄτοπον εἰς αὐτὸν γινόμενον, μεταβαλό-

42 *ἐξ αὐτῶν c.Th.*: *om. cett., Ambst.* διαφύγῃ] + ἐξ αὐτῶν 𝔖^{vg}
43 βουλόμενος . . . βουλήματος] prohibuit hoc fieri praecipue propter Paulum ut salvum illum faceret 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Bl.* τε] δέ *C* 614, 𝔖^{ph} ἐκκολυμβᾶν (enatare) *B*, 𝔏^{g} ἀπορρίψαντας *om.* 𝔏^{g} ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ℵ 614 ἐξιέναι] et evadere et . . . exire *vg.* (*duabus lectt. conflatis*) 44 οὓς μέν . . . οὓς δέ] τοὺς μέν . . . τοὺς δέ 614 σανίσιν] + σωθῆναι 𝔏^{g}: + ἔφερον *vg.* οὓς δέ . . . πλοίου *om.* 𝔏^{g} καὶ οὕτως . . . τὴν γῆν] et sic omnes animae salvae ad terram venerunt 𝔏^{g}, *Bl.*: et sic factum est ut omnes animae evaderent ad terram *vg.* (ἐγένετο *om.* 𝔖^{vg}) XXVIII 1 διασωθέντες *om.* 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg} Μελιτήνη *B*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{ph} 2 δέ ℵ 𝔏^{g}: τε *cett.* προσανελάμβανον ℵ: προσελάβοντο *ABC* πάντας *om. A*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈, *Ambst.* 3 τι *om.* δ, 𝔏^{g} διεξελθοῦσα δ, *Chr.* καθήψατο *C* 614 4 πρὸς ἀλλήλους *om.* 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 πάντως φονεύς ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος] is homo homicida debet esse 𝔏^{g} 5 ἀποτινάξας] excutiens manum suam et eiciens 𝔖 κακόν *om.* ℵ 6 προσεδόκων] existimabant 𝔏^{g} *vg.* (= ἐδόκουν) μέλλειν *om.* 𝔏^{g} ἐμπίμπρασθαι (intumescere) ℵ, 𝔏^{s}, 𝔖^{ph}: πίμπρασθαι *AB* δ θεωρούντων] intuiti essent *c.Th.* μεταβαλόμενοι *AB*: μεταβαλλόμενοι ℵ δ, *Chr.* 7 ὅς . . . ἐξένισεν] qui nos hospitio humane accepit per triduum 𝔏^{g} ἡμέρας

μενοι ἔλεγον αὐτὸν εἶναι θεόν. 7 ἐν δὲ τοῖς περὶ τὸν τόπον
ἐκεῖνον ὑπῆρχεν χωρία τῷ πρώτῳ τῆς νήσου ὀνόματι Ποπλίῳ,
ὃς ἀναδεξάμενος ἡμᾶς ἡμέρας τρεῖς φιλοφρόνως ἐξένισεν.
8 ἐγένετο δὲ τὸν πατέρα τοῦ Ποπλίου πυρετοῖς καὶ δυσεντερίῳ
συνεχόμενον κατακεῖσθαι· πρὸς ὃν ὁ Παῦλος εἰσελθὼν καὶ
προσευξάμενος, ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ ἰάσατο αὐτόν.
9 τούτου δὲ **ἀκουστοῦ** γενομένου καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ ἐν τῇ νήσῳ
ἔχοντες ἀσθενείας προσήρχοντο καὶ ἐθεραπεύοντο· 10 οἳ
καὶ πολλαῖς τιμαῖς ἐτίμησαν ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἀναγομένοις ἐπέθεντο
τὰ πρὸς τὰς χρείας. 11 μετὰ δὲ τρεῖς μῆνας ἀνήχθημεν
ἐν πλοίῳ παρακεχειμακότι ἐν τῇ νήσῳ Ἀλεξανδρίνῳ, παρασήμῳ
Διοσκούροις. 12 καὶ καταχθέντες εἰς Συρακούσας ἐπεμείνα-
μεν ἡμέρας τρεῖς, 13 ὅθεν περιελόντες κατηντήσαμεν εἰς
Ῥήγιον. καὶ μετὰ μίαν ἡμέραν ἐπιγενομένου νότου δευτεραῖοι
ἤλθομεν εἰς Ποτιόλους, 14 οὗ εὑρόντες ἀδελφοὺς παρεκλή-
θημεν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐπιμείναντες ἡμέρας ἑπτά· καὶ οὕτως εἰς τὴν
Ῥώμην ἤλθαμεν. 15 κἀκεῖθεν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἀκούσαντες τὰ
περὶ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθον εἰς ἀπάντησιν ἡμῖν ἄχρις Ἀππίου Φόρου
καὶ Τριῶν Ταβερνῶν, οὓς ἰδὼν ὁ Παῦλος εὐχαριστήσας τῷ
Θεῷ ἔλαβεν θάρσος. 16 ὅτε δὲ εἰσήλθομεν εἰς Ῥώμην,
ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης παρέδωκεν τοὺς δεσμίους τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῃ,
τῷ δὲ Παύλῳ ἐπετράπη μένειν καθ' ἑαυτὸν **ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς**

τρεῖς *B* 614 : τρεῖς ἡμ. ℵ *A* 383 (+ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ 𝔖) 8 δυσεντερίᾳ δ, *Chr.* 9 ἀκουστοῦ *c. Th.* : *om. cett.* καὶ οἱ] οἱ *B* οἱ . . . ἔχοντες ἀσθενείας] qui . . . commorabantur infirmantes 𝔏^{g} 10 ἀναγομένοις] + ἡμῖν 𝔏^{g} : + ἐκεῖθεν 𝔖 ἐπέθεντο] + ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ 𝔖^{ph} 11 παρασήμῳ Διοσκούροις] cui erat insigne Castorum (Dioscouris 𝔖^{ph}) 𝔖 : cui erat parasemum et dioscore 𝔏^{g} : ᾧ ἦν παράσημον Διοσκούρων *Bl.* 12 ἐπεμείναμεν] + ἐκεῖ 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈 ἡμέραις τρισίν *B* 13 ὅθεν περιελόντες ℵ *B* : ὅθεν περιελθόντες *A* δ, 𝔖 : et inde tulimus et (= καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἄραντες) 𝔏^{g} 14 παρ' αὐτοῖς] ἐπ' αὐτοῖς δ : inter eos 𝔖^{ph} : *om.* 𝔏^{g} ἐπιμείναντες (+ apud eos 𝔖) 614, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖 : ἐπιμεῖναι Γ 383, *vg.*, 𝔈 ἑπτά] τέσσαρας 𝔏^{g} 15 κἀκεῖθεν] καί 𝔏^{g} οἱ *om. B* τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν *om.* 𝔏^{g} *vg.* ἐξῆλθον δ, 𝔖 : ἦλθον Γ ὑπάντησιν ℵ ἡμῖν] ἡμῶν 614 : ὑμῖν ℵ ἄχρις δ : ἄχρι Γ εὐχαριστήσας τῷ θεῷ ἔλαβεν θάρσος] sumpsit audaciam et laudem dedit deo 𝔏^{g} 16 ἤλθομεν δ, *Chr.* τὴν Ῥώμην ℵ 614 ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης . . . στρατοπεδάρχῃ (praefecto 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q} : principi peregrinorum 𝔏^{g}) δ, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*^{aqw}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈 : *om.* Γ, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} τῷ δὲ Παύλῳ ἐπετράπη δ, 𝔏^{gp} : et permisit centurio Paulo 𝔖^{vg} : ἐπετράπη τῷ Παύλῳ Γ, *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph} καθ' ἑαυτόν *om.* 𝔏^{gp} ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς 614, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*^{qw}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Ambst.* : *om. cett.*

σὺν τῷ φυλάσσοντι αὐτὸν στρατιώτῃ. 17 ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ
ἡμέρας τρεῖς συγκαλέσασθαι αὐτὸν τοὺς ὄντας τῶν Ἰουδαίων
πρώτους· συνελθόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἔλεγεν πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἐγώ,
ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, οὐδὲν ἐναντίον ποιήσας τῷ λαῷ ἢ τοῖς ἔθεσιν
τοῖς πατρῴοις δέσμιος ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων παρεδόθην εἰς τὰς
χεῖρας τῶν Ῥωμαίων, 18 οἵτινες **πολλὰ** ἀνακρίναντές με
ἐβούλοντο ἀπολῦσαι διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν αἰτίαν θανάτου ὑπάρχειν
ἐν ἐμοί· 19 ἀντιλεγόντων δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων **καὶ ἐπικραζόντων·
Αἶρε τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἡμῶν,** ἠναγκάσθην ἐπικαλέσασθαι Καίσαρα,
οὐχ ὡς τοῦ ἔθνους μου ἔχων τι κατηγορεῖν, **ἀλλ' ἵνα λυτρώσω-
μαι τὴν ψυχήν μου ἐκ θανάτου.** 20 διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν
αἰτίαν παρεκάλεσα ὑμᾶς ἰδεῖν καὶ προσλαλῆσαι, ἕνεκεν γὰρ
τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ τὴν ἅλυσιν ταύτην περίκειμαι.
21 οἱ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπαν· Ἡμεῖς οὔτε γράμματα κατά σου
ἐδεξάμεθα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, οὔτε παραγενόμενός τις τῶν ἀδελ-
φῶν ἀπήγγειλεν ἢ ἐλάλησέν τι περί σου πονηρόν. 22 ἀξιοῦ-
μεν δὲ παρὰ σοῦ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ φρονεῖς· περὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς αἱρέσεως
ταύτης γνωστόν ἐστιν ἡμῖν ὅτι πανταχοῦ ἀντιλέγεται. 23 τα-
ξάμενοι δὲ αὐτῷ ἡμέραν ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ξενίαν
πλείονες, οἷς ἐξετίθετο διαμαρτυρόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ
Θεοῦ, πείθων τε αὐτοὺς περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀπό τε τοῦ νόμου

16 σὺν . . . στρατιώτῃ] custodientibus eum militibus 𝔏^{g} 17 ἐγένετο . . . συνεκαλέσατο 𝔏^{gs} : convocavit (*om.* ἐγένετο) *vg.* τοὺς ὄντας . . . πρώτους] primos Iudaeorum 𝔏^{g} *vg.* (Iudaeorum priores 𝔏^{s}) συνελθόντων δὲ αὐτῶν *om.* 𝔈 ἔλεγεν πρὸς αὐτούς] conferebat cum illis 𝔏^{gs}, *Bl.* ἐγώ *cett.* : λέγων ℵ : λέγων, ἐγώ 𝔏^{gs} λαῷ] νόμῳ 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q} 18 πολλά 614, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett.* ἐβούλοντο] + με ℵ, 𝔖 19 καὶ ἐπικραζόντων . . . ἡμῶν 614, 𝔖^{ph}, *Bl.* : *om. cett.* κατηγορῆσαι δ ἀλλ' ἵνα . . . θανάτου 614, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*^{q}, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett.* (𝔏^{s}) 20 προσλαλῆσαι] + ὑμῖν 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈 εἵνεκεν ℵ *A* περίκειμαι] circumfero hic 𝔏^{g} 21 πρὸς αὐτόν *cett.* (𝔏^{s}) : *om.* 𝔏^{g} κατά ℵ, 𝔏^{ps} : περί *cett.* ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας *cett.* (𝔏^{s}) : ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων (*post* σου) 𝔏^{g} τις *cett.* (𝔏^{s}) : + ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Bl.* ἀπήγγειλεν ἤ *om.* 𝔖^{vg} τι *cett.* (𝔏^{s}) : τις *Hier.* : *om.* 𝔏^{gp} 22 ἐστὶν ἡμῖν δ, 𝔏^{gps} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}, *Hier.* : ἡμῖν ἐστίν Γ πανταχοῦ (+ αὐτῇ *vg. Hier.*) ἀντιλέγεται *cett.* (𝔏^{s}) : contradicitur in toto orbe 𝔏^{p} : ubique contradicitur ei in toto orbe 𝔏^{g}, *Bl.* 23 ἦλθον Γ : ἧκον δ, *Chr.* πλείονες *post* ξενίαν *hab. cett.* (𝔏^{s}), *ante* πρὸς αὐτόν 𝔏^{g}, *post* πρὸς αὐτόν 𝔖^{vg} 24 τοῖς] + ἀπὸ τοῦ Παύλου 𝔏^{gp} 25 δέ] τε ℵ, 𝔏^{gps} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg} πρὸς ἀλλήλους *om.* 𝔏^{p} ὅτι *om.* 𝔏^{ps} τὸ ἅγιον *om.* 𝔏^{p} ἐλάλησεν *ante* τὸ πνεῦμα *hab.* 𝔏^{g}, *Ambst.* διὰ Ἠσαΐου τοῦ

Μωσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν ἀπὸ πρωῒ ἕως ἑσπέρας. 24 *καὶ*
οἱ μὲν ἐπείθοντο τοῖς λεγομένοις, οἱ δὲ ἠπίστουν· 25 *ἀσύμ-*
φωνοι δὲ ὄντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀπελύοντο, εἰπόντος τοῦ Παύλου
ῥῆμα ἓν ὅτι Καλῶς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἐλάλησεν διὰ Ἠσαΐου
τοῦ προφήτου πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν 26 *λέγων· Πορεύθητι*
πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον καὶ εἰπόν· Ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ
συνῆτε, καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε· 27 *ἐπαχύνθη*
γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν,
καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν, μή ποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς
ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ
ἐπιστρέψωσιν, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς. 28 *γνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω*
ὑμῖν, ὅτι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπεστάλη τοῦτο τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ·
αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀκούσονται. 29 **καὶ ταῦτα αὐτοῦ εἰπόντος ἀπῆλθον**
οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πολλὴν ἔχοντες ἐν ἑαυτοῖς συζήτησιν. 30 *ἐνέμεινεν*
δὲ **ὁ Παῦλος** *διετίαν ὅλην ἐν ἰδίῳ μισθώματι, καὶ ἀπεδέχετο*
πάντας τοὺς εἰσπορευομένους πρὸς αὐτὸν **καὶ διελέγετο πρὸς**
Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας, 31 *κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν*
τοῦ Θεοῦ **διϊσχυριζόμενος** *καὶ διδάσκων τὰ περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου*
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας ἀκωλύτως, **ὅτι οὗτός**
ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, δι' οὗ μέλλει ὅλος ὁ κόσμος κρίνε-
σθαι.

προφήτου *om. Ambst.* : τοῦ προφήτου *om.* 𝔏^{p} ὑμῶν *cett.* (𝔏^{s}) : ἡμῶν δ, 𝔏^{g} *vg.* : *om.* 𝔖^{ph} 26 λέγον *A* 614, *Chr.* ἀκούσητε *AE* συνῆτε *cett.* (𝔏^{s}) : ἀκούσητε 𝔏^{gp} βλέψητε *AE* ἴδητε] εἰδῆτε *E*, 𝔖^{ph} 27 ἐπαχύνθη *cett.*, *Iren. Orig.*^{lat} *Hier.* : ἐβαρύνθη ℵ : βάρυνε 𝔏^{gp} καὶ τοῖς . . . ἤκουσαν *om.* 𝔏^{gp} ἐκάμμυσαν] obscura 𝔏^{gp} καί . . . συνῶσιν *om.* ℵ καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν *om.* 𝔏^{p} ἰάσομαι Γ δ, 𝔏^{p1}, *Iren.* : ἰάσωμαι *E*, 𝔏^{gp2} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}, *Orig.*^{lat}, *Hier.* 28 τοῦτο *om. E* δ, 𝔖^{ph} αὐτοὶ καί] αὐτοί 𝔏^{g} : αὐτοὶ γάρ 𝔖 29 καὶ ταῦτα . . . συζήτησιν δ, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Cass.* : *om.* Γ *E*, 𝔖^{vg} 30 ἐνέμεινεν ℵ *B* : ἐπέμεινεν 614 : ἔμεινεν *AE* 383 : manens (*post* μισθ.) 𝔏^{p} (+ ὁ Παῦλος 383, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖) πρὸς αὐτόν] + Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας 614, 𝔖^{ph} καὶ διελέγετο 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*^{q} : *om. cett.* πρὸς Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας 𝔏^{gp}, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* 31 διϊσχυριζόμενος 𝔏^{p} : *om. cett.* διδάσκων] dicens (= docens) 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q} τὰ περί . . . Χριστοῦ (*om.* Χριστοῦ ℵ 614, 𝔖^{ph}) *cett. Ephr.* : *om.* 𝔏^{p}, *Bl.* μετὰ πάσης (*om.* πάσης *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈) παρρησίας *cett.* : *om.* 𝔏^{p}, *Bl.* ἀκωλύτως] + λέγων 𝔖^{ph} ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς (ὁ Χριστὸς Ἰησ. 𝔖^{ph}) ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (+ ζῶντος *spec.*) δι' οὗ μέλλει ὅλος ὁ κόσμος κρίνεσθαι (+ ἀμήν 𝔏^{p2}, 𝔖^{ph}) 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{qw}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Ephr.*, *spec.* : *om. cett.* *Eus.*

WITNESSES TO THE *Z* TEXT

GREEK MSS.

(1) CODEX BEZAE (*D*)

The contents of this article are:

I. Correctors and annotators of *D*.

II. The use of *στίχοι* or 'sense-lines' in *D*.

III. Various errors (i) common to *D* (the Greek side) and $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ (the Latin side): (ii) peculiar to *D*: (iii) peculiar to $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

IV. Graecisms in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

V. Vocabulary of $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

VI. Relation of $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ to the Gigas ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) in Acts.

The first of these sections is connected with a question discussed in the Introduction, viz. the provenance of *D*. The others give the evidence for various statements made in the Introduction but not discussed. I attach particular importance to (iv), since I regard the unexampled number and character of the Graecisms in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ as proof that the home of the MS. is to be sought in the East, not, as is generally supposed, in the West. With regard to certain statistics given in (v), it may be well to mention that they are drawn from unpublished material which I put together in the course of a laborious inquiry. My original purpose was to study the Latinity of $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ in Acts, but I found it necessary to go on to $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ in Evv., then to all the Old-Latin MSS. in Evv. and Acts, and then to a number of authors, chiefly patristic. I hope some day to publish a complete study of this material, which is too large for treatment in the present work. This article is not intended to be in any way exhaustive. There are a number of subjects upon which I have nothing new to contribute, and could only repeat what is said in various well-known handbooks. I therefore think it best to confine myself to the treatment of certain controversial points to which attention has been drawn in the Introduction.

I. Correctors and Annotators of *D*

D contains a large number of marginalia and notes, which may be classed roughly under two heads, (*a*) corrections of the text, (*b*) liturgical notes and miscellaneous scrawls. Scrivener attempted to distinguish between these hands and to fix their dates, but made some singular errors, and it is now acknowledged that his datings are quite untrustworthy.

(a) *Corrections of the Text.*

A number of these were made by the original scribe, e.g. additions of omitted passages and corrections of errors in the order of *στίχοι* on the Latin side (cf. p. 187). Apart from such alterations made by the first hand, Scrivener recognizes five ancient correctors, whom he styles *A*, *B*, *C*, *D*, *E*. He ascribes the first four of these to the seventh century, but gives no date for *E*. These

writers deal chiefly with small points, almost entirely on the Greek side, and I do not propose to discuss them here. The next corrector *F* is said to be 'younger than any yet named'. Scrivener ascribes to him the addition in Acts ii. 31 of προειδὼς ἐλάλησεν περὶ τῆς, where *D* omitted a στίχος: no correction is made on the Latin side.[1] As Scrivener, on insufficient grounds, thought *D* to be a sixth-century MS., he also underestimates the antiquity of these correctors. Thus Kenyon has pointed out that *F* may be a seventh-century hand.[2]

Scrivener's next corrector, whom he calls *G*, is described by him as being of 'about the eleventh century'. He says that *G* is 'one of the most diligent, least instructive, and the most troublesome to an editor of all the many correctors': also, that the colour of his ink, 'a kind of yellow ochre', and his peculiar script, 'his rude, Gothic-looking, sometimes angular characters', cannot be confounded with any others. It is now universally admitted that Scrivener was greatly deceived in his dating of *G*. This was pointed out by Sanday and demonstrated by Burkitt,[3] who considers *G* to have been a contemporary writer, i. e. a fifth-century scribe. This is also the opinion of Dr. E. A. Lowe.[4] The most striking example of *G*'s script occurs in Mt. xviii. 18, where he adds two στίχοι which had been dropped, both on the Greek and on the Latin side, viz.:

εσται δεδεμενα εν τοις ουρανοις
και οσα αν λυσητε επι της γης
erunt ligata in caelis
et quaecumque solueritis in terram

The work of *G* is chiefly apparent on the Latin side. He corrects confusions of *b* and *v* and suggests alternative renderings, e. g. Mt. xvii. 24, where the original scribe gave *praestat* (= τελεῖ), he enters in the margin *facit aut praestat*, and in Acts ii. 2 for *echo* (= ἦχος) he substitutes *vox*. Other examples are given by Burkitt, who holds that his alterations were not taken from the Old-Latin or the Vulgate, and calls him 'a scholar reading over the text pen in hand and making quite freely on his own authority such changes as appeared to him desirable.' Burkitt makes the bold suggestion that *G* may have been the bishop in charge of the church for which *D* was written, and that he entered his corrections before it was used in public worship. Without going so far as this, we must fully recognize the importance of these corrections, which show that soon after the MS. was written it was annotated by a person who had a competent knowledge of Latin, while other annotators with few exceptions confined themselves to the Greek side.

Before quitting *G* it may be observed that Scrivener, when referring to a marginal note in Latin on f. 73 *a*, which gives the names of the Magi and the crucified thieves, ascribes it to a 'recent hand', which he says 'looks a little like the hand of *G*, but is not so old'. I am informed by Lowe that this note

[1] Scrivener ascribes to *F* the addition on the Greek side of κάλαμον συντετριμμένον Mt. xii. 20 (f. 36 *b*), where on the Latin side *harundinem quassatam* is added by *G*.

[2] *J. T. S.*, i. (1900) p. 296.

[3] *J. T. S.*, iii. (1902) p. 506.

[4] *Bulletin Bezan Club*, v. (Feb. 1928) p. 32.

was written in France, *c.* A.D. 800, by a scribe who was accustomed to write charters. The script is entirely different from that of *G*.

Scrivener treats next two scribes whom he calls *H* and *K*. They are said to have defaced the MS. by a 'violent process of presumed amendment', especially in Acts, i.e. by erasing the original reading and substituting that of ordinary MSS. He does not assign any date to them, and it would be difficult to do so, since the result of their erasures and substitutions is frequently a mere smudge.

(b) *Liturgical notes and miscellaneous scrawls.*

The bulk of these are ascribed to hands which Scrivener denotes by *L* and *M*. Reference is also made to two scribes, absent from the previous list (after *H*), whom he calls *I* and *J*. The first of these is of no importance, since nothing is attributed to him except two liturgical notes. The case of *J*, however, is different, since Scrivener ascribes to this hand important corrections as well as liturgical notes. He nowhere discusses *J*, but first introduces the symbol (p. xxvii, l. 20) when dealing with liturgical notes written by *L*. He there says that '*J* cannot well be anterior to the ninth century'. His treatment of *J* is most confusing and unsatisfactory. Some of his attributions are made doubtfully ('*J ut videtur*').[1] Rendel Harris rejects them all, except two (ff. 67 *b*, 150 *b*), both of which refer to the same feast (Palm Sunday).

I now come to the important annotators known as *L* and *M*. It is to be premised that these writers have two things in common, viz. that their work is all on the Greek side, and that their Greek is very illiterate.

L is responsible for the lectionary marks which occur throughout the MS., though in Acts they are rare. The lectionary system, as Dr. Brightman has shown, is that of the Byzantine rite (cf. p. lvi). The Ammonian sections in the margin of the Greek are added by *L*. His square and somewhat stiff uncials are unmistakable. His orthography leaves much to be desired. The lesson (ἀνάγνωσμα) is generally denoted by ΑΝΝΑΓΝΟϹΜΑ, but sometimes ΑΝΝΟϹΜΑ is used. A lesson for Sunday is termed περι (or περη) του (or το) κυριακη, and one for Saturday is described as περι (περη) του (το) σαββατου (-τον). We also find lessons for special days, e.g. f. 279 *b* αυναγνοσμα εις τιν (= την) παρασκευγην (= παρασκευην).

The date of *L* is a matter of controversy. His script certainly looks ancient and somewhat resembles that of the original scribe, especially in the ΤΕΛΟϹ which he adds in the right-hand margin, to mark the end of a lesson. D. Schulz, quoted by Scrivener (p. xxvii), said '*Haec glossemata antiquissima, si minus a prima quidem manu, at certe ante saeculum septimum iamiam adscripta esse.*' For this judgement he is rebuked by Scrivener, who produces

[1] An interesting case occurs on ff. 160 *b*, 161 *a* (= Jn. xv. 3-4), where the first hand omits the words ἤδη ὑμεῖς καθαροί ἐστε διὰ τὸν λόγον ὃν λελάληκα ὑμῖν· μείνατε ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν. καθὼς τὸ κλῆμα οὐ δύναται καρπὸν φέρειν. On the Greek side, as Lowe pointed out to me, two correctors have been at work. The first added at the foot of the page on the Greek side ἤδη . . . τὸν λόγον and on the Latin *iam uobis mundi estis propter uerbum*. This corrector is not later than the sixth century. A second corrector added in slightly smaller uncials the rest of the omitted passage (ὃν λελάληκα . . . φέρειν), but made no addition on the Latin side. Scrivener ascribes the additions to the ninth century, '*nescio qua manu, forsan J*'.

an interesting piece of evidence. This occurs on f. 150 *b*, where Scrivener's mysterious corrector *J* inserted in the margin τη κυριακη των προφδτησματων. Above this *L* adds αυναγνοσμα περη and alters τη to το. He infers, therefore, that *L* is later than *J*, and, as he places *J* in the ninth century, concludes that *L* cannot be prior to this date. The date, however, which he assigns to *J* is very insecure. Professor A. S. Hunt informs me that the note here ascribed to him might have been written at any time between the seventh century and the ninth century. Dr. Lowe speaks more strongly and would assign it to the seventh century at latest.

I now pass on to *M*. This symbol is used by Scrivener to include a number of notes which differ in appearance as well as in contents. In Mt., Jn., and Lk. there are numerous τίτλοι or *indices* to the context, generally at the top of the page. In Mt. an eccentric type of large uncial is employed. In Jn. and Lk. cursive scripts, sometimes difficult to read, are used. In Mk. there are no τίτλοι, but at the foot of ff. 285 *b*–321 *b* (= chs. i–x) we find a remarkable series of *sortes sanctorum*[1] written in abnormal uncials. Scrivener attempts to distinguish the various hands by using the symbol M_1 for the marginalia in Mt. (uncials), M_2 for those in Jn. and Lk. (cursives), M_3 for the *sortes* in Mk. (uncials), and M_4 for those in Acts. He sometimes uses *M* without qualification for some 'coarse corrections' which he ascribes to a later date. The result of this nomenclature is to produce complete confusion. I abstain from further details, and would refer the reader to the valuable work of Rendel Harris, in which the notes of all the liturgical writers are classified under the appropriate heads.[2]

The notes of the various writers included in the symbol *M* resemble those of *L* in the badness of the Greek. It will be sufficient here to quote a cursive note by M_2 on Lk. vi. 3 (f. 205 *b*), δαυγι ωτε ισηλθεν εν το θυσιαστιρηον και φαγεν τōς αρτōς τις προθεσεος. Here δαυγι = David. This insertion of γ is frequent in *M* as well as in *L*. Scrivener thought that it pointed to a 'Western and Celtic origin of all this writing'. This view is refuted by Rendel Harris, who quotes Krumbacher and other authorities to show that the insertion of γ is not restricted to any area, but is a general characteristic of late Greek.

Scrivener uses vague language about the marginalia in Evv., but appears to attribute those in Mt. (M_1), and possibly some others, to the tenth century. Those which he calls *M* without qualification are assigned by him to the twelfth century. Professor Hunt, whom I consulted in the hope that he would be able to date these hands, especially the cursive scripts in Jn. and Lk. (M_2), expressed himself with caution. He thought that the uncials used in Mt. and Mk. (M_1 and M_3) were essentially abnormal and could not be assigned to a definite date, while the cursive notes (M_2) could be paralleled from documents of various dates. The formula which he prefers to use for M_1, M_2, M_3 is 'seventh–eighth century'. He spoke more confidently about the annotations in Acts (M_4), especially about the shape of a very large epsilon used above τ to signify τέλος, which he thought compatible with extreme antiquity.

[1] For the use of these *sortes* cf. Rendel Harris, *Annotators of the codex Bezae* (1901), pp. 59–69.

[2] ib., pp. 27–44.

I now return to *L*. Reference has already been made to a passage (f. 150 *b*) quoted by Scrivener to show that *L* expands an entry previously made by the corrector whom he calls *J*.[1] I have myself noticed two cases where the cursive script (M_2) appears to be prior to *L*. One of these occurs on f. 236 *b* (Lk. xii. 16). Here M_2 entered in the margin *περι πολυσιȣ* (= *πλουσίου*) opposite to *v.* 16, where the lesson begins. *L*, finding the proper place occupied, inserted *ανναγνοσμα περι του κυριακη* above the scrawl of M_2, opposite to *v.* 15. The other case occurs on f. 257 *b* (Lk. xviii. 18). Here M_2 entered in the margin *περι επεροτισεος* (= *ἐπερωτήσεως*) *αρχοντος και του ζαχεου* opposite to *v.* 18 (*καὶ ἐπηρώτησέν τις αὐτὸν ἄρχων*). *L* added *ανναγνοσμα περι του σαββατου*, attaching his note to *v.* 17.

It would appear from these instances that the date of *L* and the relation of this corrector to M_2, as well as to Scrivener's *J*, is somewhat uncertain. On the other hand, Hunt was much impressed by the archaic appearance of *L*'s script and its resemblance in some respects to that of the original scribe. He thought that, if the writer was really posterior to M_2 and '*J*', he must have copied not unskilfully an older script. Lowe, however, is strongly of opinion that the script is a natural hand and shows no symptoms of imitation. The conclusion to which I incline is that *L* is really an ancient hand, possibly of the seventh century, but that M_2 and '*J*' are slightly anterior to it in the same century.

Scrivener mentions two more hands which he calls *N* and *O*. He describes *N* as 'a large scrawl in charcoal', chiefly found in the earlier pages of the MS. to mark the beginning and end of Lessons. *O* is said to be 'a large, vulgar scrawl dating early in the twelfth century in vile brown paint'. This hand occurs eight times in Acts, in five of which (ff. 418 *b*, 419 *b*, 420 *b*, 463 *b*, 474 *b*) it adds a large and dictatorial *τε* (= *τέλος*) in the margin. It is also found in three large and illiterate scrawls, ff. 418 *b τι πεντεκοστι*, 462 *b του αγιου* [*γε*]*ωργιου*, 488 *b του αγιου διονυσιου αρεωπαγιτου*. It must not be assumed that this script is necessarily late, as Scrivener supposes. Hunt's remark on looking at f. 488 *b* was that the scrawl was simply illiterate, and could not be dated. It might have been written at any time from the fifth century onwards.

The general result of my examination was to convince me that Lowe's statement of the facts is perfectly correct. With the exception of Scrivener's scribe *G*, who knew Latin as well as Greek, the early annotators with trifling exceptions confined themselves to the Greek side of the MS. It is important to notice that their Greek shows no signs of degeneration. At a later period the MS. was used as a lectionary book in some place where bad Greek was spoken. The lectionary marks, however, are all on the Greek side. The annotators show no interest in the Latin side, and there is no evidence that they understood the language. This would be impossible if the MS. had then been anywhere in the Western world. In the ninth century *D* was without doubt domiciled in the south of France, probably at Lyons. This is shown not only

[1] Scrivener has a curious note (p. 449) upon f. 151 *b* (= Jn. xiii. 18–19), where *L* attaches *τέλος* to *v.* 18 instead of to *v.* 19, its proper place. The mistake is rectified by a corrector, who attaches an additional *τέλος* to *v.* 19, in a hand entirely different from that of '*J*' on f. 150 *b*. Scrivener, however, ascribes this correction to '*J*', thus making '*J*' posterior to *L*. The error must be prior to the correction.

by the entry on f. 73*a*, already mentioned, in a French ninth-century hand, but by the insertion of nine leaves, written in a Caroline script, in which lacunae on the Latin side were supplied from the Vulgate. It was suggested by Dom Quentin that Adon of Lyons (*c.* 850), who quotes in his martyrology several readings characteristic of *Z*, obtained them from *D*. Lowe has pointed out that the added leaves show two features which connect them definitely with Lyons, viz. 'the use of blue ink, instead of red, in a colophon, and of a peculiar three-shaped sign of interrogation, found exclusively in Lyons MSS.' He identifies the writer of these sheets with Florus the Deacon, a contemporary of Adon, a well-known copyist and scholar, whose script is found in a number of MSS.

The conclusion therefore is that cod. Bezae migrated from the East to the West some time, probably early, in the ninth century. According to Beza's statement, it was found in the monastery of St. Irenaeus in Lyons during the Civil War (i. e. after the city was sacked by the Huguenots), in 1562.

II. Στίχοι in *D*

It is usual to say that *D* is written in 'sense-lines'. This description is more or less true of *D* in the case of Mt., Mk., and Acts, in which, with occasional exceptions, the lines are divided according to the sense. It is not, however, equally true in that of Jn. and Lk., in which the tendency is to neglect the natural divisions of the sentence, and to use lines of much the same length regardless of the sense.

Ancient writers upon rhetoric were accustomed to distinguish between κῶλα (*membra*) and κόμματα (*incisa*), the former term denoting clauses of the sentence and the latter minor divisions. The subject is closely connected with the study of ancient prose-rhythm, which does not concern us here. Jerome employs these terms in his Preface to Isaiah (Migne xxviii, p. 771), where he says:

quod in Demosthene et Tullio solet fieri ut per cola scribantur et commata.

Another term used for a 'sense-line' is στίχος. Thus Suidas says κῶλον οὖν ὁ ἀπηρτισμένην ἔννοιαν ἔχων στίχος: so Joannes Siculus says στίχους δὲ κοινῶς οὗτοι καλοῦσιν ἅπαντες εἰ μόνον ἀπαρτίζοιεν ἔννοιαν. The term στίχοι is used in this sense by Scrivener and other writers to describe the lines in *D*. I therefore take it over from them, merely remarking that this meaning of στίχος is quite different from that assigned to it by Graux, Birt, and other writers upon 'stichometry', who use στίχος for a supposed 'normal line' in ancient authors consisting of 35–7 letters.[1]

No MSS. of classical authors arranged *per cola et commata* have come down to us, but such an arrangement is not infrequent in MSS. of the Vulgate. There are indications in other MSS., written in lines of equal length, which show that they were drawn from models written in sense-στίχοι. Thus

[1] The theory of a 'normal line' receives no support from papyri, in which all sorts of sizes occur. Cf. *Descent of MSS.*, pp. 43–5.

Grenfell and Hunt, speaking of a papyrus containing part of the Epistle to the Hebrews, *Oxy.* 657, fourth century, say that 'the system of punctuation is remarkable, for it seems to correspond to an earlier division into στίχοι longer than those in extant MSS. and frequently coinciding with the arrangement in the edition of Blass.' Reichardt, describing the Graeco-Latin *cod. Boernerianus*, ninth century, says:

'Die grossen Anfangsbuchstaben, die allenthalben im griechischen Texte auch ohne vorhergehende Sinnespause angewandt sind, zeigen deutlich, dass die Vorlage stichometrisch geschrieben war. Der Schreiber kopierte die Buchstaben, wie er in seinem Exemplar fand, gab aber die stichometrische Anordnung auf.' (p. 15).

The difference between the στίχοι in various parts of *D* may be seen from the following figures. I take first abnormally short lines, viz. those consisting of one or two words only.

	Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.	Acts
1 word	3	1	0	1	11
2 words	71	5	5	37	70

The instances of one word are Mt. i. 23, xxv. 34, xxvii. 23: Jn. iv. 20: Mk. xiv. 1: Acts ii. 21, 38, 41, iv. 2, 4, v. 37, viii. 7, 16, 25, xiii. 16, xvii. 25. It is to be noticed that in all cases except Mt. i. 23 (Ἐμμανουήλ) the single word is a verb, e.g. Acts ii. 21 σωθήσεται. Where a στίχος consists of two words, one of these is frequently καί, e.g. Acts iv. 24 καὶ εἶπαν, or the article, e.g. Acts ii. 1 τῆς πεντηκοστῆς.

It will be seen that there is a general similarity between Mt. and Acts in the use of occasional short lines, while Mk. has an intermediate position between them and Jn. + Lk. As it is in Mt. and Acts that the arrangement according to sense is most exact, I look on these short στίχοι as a mark of antiquity.

I have not thought it worth while to tabulate the longer στίχοι. It is sufficient to say that, except in Jn. and Lk., where they tend to become uniform, they vary greatly in length.

Another point in which Jn. and Lk. differ from Mt., Mk., and Acts, is that the article is frequently placed at the end of a στίχος, e. g. Jn. xv. 10:

μειvατε εν τη αγαπη τη εμη εαν τας
εντολας μου τηρησητε μενειτε εν τη
αγαπη

The figures for this irregularity are:

Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.	A
3	53	135	6	3[1]

Here again the similarity between Mt. and Acts is to be noted. There are cases, chiefly in Jn. and Lk., in which a word is divided between two στίχοι. Generally it is a compound which is thus treated, but not always.

Sometimes *D* and 𝔏ᵈ agree in the division. I have noticed the following cases, all in Lk.:

Lk. v. 19, αποσ|τεγασαντες: de|tegentes: vi. 9, αγαθο|ποιησαι: ben|facere,

[1] Acts ii. 31, vi. 9, x. 41 (cf. iii. 2, xvi. 12).

N 2

48, τεθεμε|λιωτο: fun|data: vii. 20, προσ|δοκωμεν: ex|pectamus: x. 35, προσ|δαπανησεις: super|erogaueris: xxi. 36, καταξιω|θητε: digni | habeamini: xxii. 10, εισ|πορευετε: intro|ierit.

The following eccentric divisions, found in *D*, are not shared by 𝔏[d]:

Jn. xiii. 36, συν|ακολουθησαι: Lk. i. 1, απο|ταξασθαι: v. 1, δια|πορευεσθαι: vi. 38, αντι|μετρηθησεται: vii. 6, εισ|ελθης, 29, τελω|ναι: viii. 16, εισ|πορευομενοι: xxiii. 18, παν|πληθει: Mk. vi. 18, αυ|την, 51, ε|αυτους: Acts iii. 26, αποσ|τρεφειν.

No case occurs in Mt. and only one in Acts. In Mk. there are only two, but they are very striking.

The following are peculiar to 𝔏[d]:

Mt. xviii. 33, con|seruo: Jn. vi. 18, in|surgebat: xii. 42, confiteban|tur: Lk. xx. 24, super|inscriptionem: xxii. 28, temptatio|nibus: Mk. xiii. 22, se|ducendos.

In Evv. *D* and 𝔏[d] not infrequently fail to correspond. The cases which I have noted are:

Mt. 17; Jn. 36; Lk. 22; Mk. 35 exx.

In Acts I have noticed only three cases, viz.:

iii. 17	και νυν ανδρες αδελφοι επισταμεθα οτι υμεις μεν κατα αγνοιαν επραξατε πονηρō et nunc uiri fratres quia uos quidem per ignorantiam egistis iniquitatem
iv. 35–6	καθοτι αν τις χρειαν ειχεν ιωσηφ δε ο επικληθεις βαρναβας υπο των αποστολω̄ secundum cuique opus erat ioseph autem qui cognominatus est barnabas ab apostolis
viii. 7–8	εθεραπευοντο χαρα τε μεγαλη εγενετο εν τη πολει εκεινη curabantur gaudium magnum factum est in ciuitate illa

These figures show clearly the superior regularity of the στίχοι in Acts.

Scrivener has some curious remarks upon the differences of the στίχοι in various parts of *D*. He notices that in Mt. they usually coincide with some pause in the sense, that in Jn. the dissolution of verses becomes much more marked, and that in Lk. 'an entire breaking up of the stichometry becomes rather the practice than the exception' (p. xviii). His explanation is that 'in course of time the ancient στίχοι were gradually dissolved by successive transcribers'. This does not account for the archaic condition of the στίχοι in Mt., which is not likely to have been less frequently transcribed than Jn. and Lk., or for the return to regularity in Mk. and Acts. A more natural suggestion would be that the Greek of Jn. and Lk. in *D* is drawn from a different source, i. e. from a MS. not divided into sense-lines, and that the στίχοι as found in *D* were arranged by an unskilful person who did not understand the ancient system.

Even in Acts the description of the στίχοι in *D* as 'sense-lines' is not infrequently misleading. I illustrate by a single example, x. 48–xi. 1:

τοτε παρεκαλεσαν αυτον προς αυτους διαμειναι
ημερας τινας ακουστον δε εγενετο
τοις αποστολοις και τοις αδελφοις

There is a break in the sense after *τινας* in *στ.* 2, where, according to the recognized division, ch. x. ends.

Other examples are v. 15, 41–2, vii. 59–60, viii. 10–11, xiv. 17–18, xv. 7–8, xvi. 12, xvii. 20, 32–3, &c.

I have not included in this list passages where an irregularity in the *στίχοι* is due to the intrusion of variants taken from Γ.

It may be noted that *καί* frequently occurs at the beginning of consecutive *στίχοι*. Thus in Acts vii. 7–10 fourteen out of seventeen *στίχοι* begin with *καί*: so in Mk. viii. 31–2 seven out of eight begin thus. Not infrequently *καί* is repeated by error, e.g. Acts xiii. 29:

και επιτυχοντες παλιν
και καθελοντες απο του ξυλου
⟨και⟩ εθηκαν εις μνημειον.

III. Errors in *D* and 𝕷[d]

(i) Errors common to *D* and 𝕷[d]

(a) *Omissions of στίχοι in D and* 𝕷[d].

Mt. xi. 5	χωλοι περιπατουσιν
xii. 20	καλαμον συντετριμμενον (*suppl. F vel G*)
xv. 32	μηποτε εκλυθωσιν εν τη οδω (*suppl. m.* 1)
xviii. 18	επι της γης εσται δεδεμενα εν τω ουρανω και οσα εαν λυσητε (*suppl. G*)
Jn. vi. 55	και το αιμα μου αληθης εστιν ποσις
Lk. ix. 46	εισηλθεν δε διαλογισμος εν αυτοις
xii. 39	αφηκεν διορυγηναι τον οικον αυτου
xix. 30	εφ ον ουδεις ανθρωπων εκαθισεν και λυσαντες αγαγετε (*suppl. m.* 1)
xxi. 37	τας δε νυκτας εξερχομενος
Mk. viii. 35	ος δ αν απολεσει αυτην (*suppl. m.* 1)

To these may be added:

Mt. xv. 37. The model of *D* appears to have had:

και το περισσευον των κλασματων ηραν ζ' σφυριδας πληρεις
οι δε αισθιοντες ησαν τετρακισχιλιοι ανδρες

In *D* the words *των . . . πληρεις* in *στ.* 1 are written by *m.* 1 *in ras.*, and *στ.* 2 is added, also by *m.* 1, between the lines.

Jn. xv. 2. *D* has:

αιρει αυτο και παν το καρποφορον
καθαριει αυτο ινα πλειονα καρπον φερη

After this D^1 omits (*vv.* 3–4) *ηδη υμεις καθαροι εστε δια τον λογον ον λελαληκα*

υμιν· μεινατε εν εμοι καγω εν υμιν. καθως το κλημα ου δυναται καρπον φερειν. The omitted words appear to have occupied three *στίχοι*.

To these omissions in Evv. I add from Acts:

ii. 31 *προιδων ελαλησεν περι της*

The missing *στίχος* is supplied by a corrector (*F*), with *προειδὼς* for *προϊδών*.

xi. 26. The model of *D* had:

συνεχυθησαν [εν τη εκκλησια
και εδιδαξαν] οχλον ικανον

D omitted the words within brackets, thus fusing two *στίχοι* into one. $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ has *commiscere ecclesiam* (*cett. om.*).

xiii. 3 *και επιθεντὲς τας χειρας αυτων*
[απελυσαν αυτους]

D omits *στ.* 2.

xix. 27. The model of *D* seems to have had:

αλλα καθαιρεισθαι μελλει
[η μεγαλειοτης αυτης ην] η ολη ασια

D has *αλλα καθέρισθαι μελλει η ολη ασια*, fusing two *στίχοι* into one.

xxi. 16 *[συνηλθον δε και των μαθητων]*
εκ κεσαρειας συν ημιν

D omits *στ.* 1.

In this short list I have included only those cases in which *D* (or *D*[1]) has omitted *στίχοι* necessary to the sense. I do not propose to complicate the issue here by introducing controversial points, such as arise when *D* omits at the end of a *στίχος* words which appear either in other members of *Z* or in Γ. I would, however, call particular attention to the cases of fusion in Acts xi. 26 and xix. 27, in relation to other passages which will be discussed subsequently.

(b) *Transpositions common to D and* $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

Mt. xvii. 12–13. *D* has:

και ουκ επεγνωσαν αυτον αλλα εποιησαν αυτω
οσα ηθελησαν
τοτε συνηκαν οι μαθηται
οτι περι ιωαννου του βαπτιστου ειπεν αυτοις
5 *ουτως και ο υιος του ανθρωπου μελλει πασχῑ υπ αυτω̃*

Here *στ.* 5 should come after *στ.* 2. The same transposition is also found in most O.-L. MSS.

Mk. x. 24–5. *D* inverts the order of these verses. The same transposition occurs in $\mathfrak{L}^{bff}$.

xiv. 69. *D* has:

παλιν δε ειδουσα αυτον η παιδισκη
ο δε παλιν ηρνησατο· και ηρξατο λεγειν
τοις παρεστηκοσιν οτι και αυτος εξ αυτων εστι

The words *ο δε παλιν ηρνησατο* should come after *στ.* 3.

(c) *Dittography of* στίχοι *in D and* $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

Mk. xiv. 16	και ἐξηλθον οι μαθηται αυτου	et abierunt discipuli eius
	και εξηλθον οι μαθηται αυτου	et uenerunt discipuli eius

Here *D* has a simple dittography, while $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ endeavours to make some sort of sense. The first στ. on the Greek side is struck out by a late corrector. There is no correction on the Latin side.

(d) *Corruptions from adjacent* στίχος, *common to D and* $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

Lk. vii. 28	ο μεικροτερος	qui minor est
	⟨αυτου⟩ εν τη βασιλεια του θ̅υ̅ μειζων	eius in regno caelorum maior
	αυτου εστιν	illo est

αὐτοῦ in στ. 2 has been introduced from στ. 3.

Acts ii. 46 και κατ οικουσαν επι το αυτο κλωντες τε αρτον
et per domos id ipsum capiebant panes

The source of -αν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό is seen from the end of *v.* 47, five στίχοι further on, where we find

καθημεραν επι το αυτο εν τη εκκλησια
cotti[di]e in unum in ecclesia

In *D* the corruption is evident, while $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ attempts to make sense by omitting -αν.

x. 38–9	οτι ο θ̅ς̅ ην μετ αυτου	quia d̅s̅ erat cum illo
	και υμεις μαρτυρες αυτου	et nos testes eius
	ων εποιησεν κ.τ.λ.	quae fecit

αὐτοῦ in στ. 2 has been introduced from στ. 1 in place of πάντων (Γ, *cett.*).

xii. 5 πολλη δε προσευχη ην
εν εκτενεια περι αυτου
απο της εκκλησιας προς τον θ̅ν̅ περι αυτου

$\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ renders περὶ αὐτοῦ by *pro eo* in στ. 2 and *super ipso* in στ. 3, thus disguising the repetition of περὶ αὐτοῦ.

xv. 33–4	προς τους αποστειλαντας αυτους	ad ipsos qui miserant eos
	εδοξε δε τω σειλεα επιμειναι αυτους	placuit autem sileae sustinere eos

αὐτούς in στ. 2, in place of αὐτοῦ, is due to αὐτούς in στ. 1.

xix. 27 αλλα και το της μεγαλης θεας
ιερον αρτεμιδος εις ουδεν λογισθησεται
αλλα καθερισθαι μελλει κ.τ.λ.

I am inclined to look on ἀλλά in στ. 3 as repeated from στ. 1 in place of καί (Γ, *cett.*). $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ has

sed etiam magnae deae
templum dianae in nihilum deputabitur
sed destrui incipiet, *etc.*

(e) *Doublets common to D and* 𝔏[d].

For a simple case in Evv. we may take Lk. xi. 34:

οταν δε πονηρος η και το σωμα σου εστιν
σκοτινον εστιν
cum autem malus fuerit et corpus tuum est
tenebrosum est

With this we may compare:

Jn. xx. 16 εκεινη λεγει αυτω εβραϊστι ραββωνει
ο λεγεται κε διδασκαλε

κύριε here is a *v. l.* for διδάσκαλε (*cett.*). 𝔏[a] has *domine*, while 𝔏[eff] have *magister et domine* (= *D*).

Mk. x. 51 ο δε τυφλος ειπεν αυτω
κε ραββει ινα αναβλεψω
caecus autem dixit ei
dn̄e rabbi ut uideam

The same conflation is found in 𝔏[bff].

v. 41 λεγει αυτη ραββι θαβιτα κουμι
ait illi rabbi thabita coumi

ραββι is a doublet for θαβιτα (= ταλιθά) peculiar to *D*.

In Acts there are a number of such doublets, e. g.:

iii. 11 οι δε θαμβηθεντες εστησαν
εν τη στοα [τ]η καλουμενη σολομωνος εκθαμβοι
stupentes autem stabant
in porticum qui uocatur solomonis stupebant.

Here θαμβηθέντες (*Z*) has been combined with ἔκθαμβοι (Γ).

xiv. 10 και ευθεως παραχρημα ανηλατο και περιεπατει
et statim subito exiliuit et ambulabat

xv. 21 Μωϋσης γαρ εκ γενεων αρχαιων
κατα πολιν εχει τους κηρυσσοντας αυτον
ε[χει] εν ταις συναγωγαις
Moyses enim ex progeniebus antiquis
per ciuitates habet qui eum praedicant
habent in synagogis

It will be noticed that 𝔏[d] disguises the repetition by substituting the plural for the singular in στ. 3.

xvi. 37 αναιτειους δειραντες ημας δημοσια
ακατακριτους ανθρωπους
anetios caesos nos publice
indemnatos homines

Here ἀναιτίους (*Z*) has been combined with ἀκατακρίτους (Γ). It is to be noticed that ἀναιτίους, after being expelled from its proper place by the intruding variant, has been inserted in the previous στ.

Among other important cases where conflations of *Z* and Γ readings are common to *D* and $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ the following may be mentioned:

xiv. 27 ανηγγειλον οσα ο θ̅ς̅ εποιησεν αυτοις
μετα των ψυχων αυτων

Here αὐτοῖς (Γ) is combined with μετά . . . αὐτῶν (*Z*). $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ has renuntiauerunt quae d̅s̅ fecit illis cum animabus eorum.

xv. 2 παρηγγειλον αυτοις τω παυλω και βαρναβα
statuerunt eis paulo et barnabae

Here αὐτοῖς has been combined with τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ (Γ, *cett.* have ἔταξαν ἀναβαίνειν Παῦλον καὶ Βαρνάβαν).

As an example of a minute but instructive reading, I quote xii. 14:

και εισδραμουσα δε απηγγειλεν
et adcurrens autem adnuntiauit

The reading of Γ here is εἰσδ. δέ without καί. *D* appears to combine καὶ εἰσδ. with εἰσδ. δέ, and is followed by $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

So far we have been concerned with errors common to *D* and $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$. I now pass on to those peculiar either to *D* or to $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

(ii) Errors peculiar to *D*.

(a) *Omissions of* στίχοι.

Lk. iii. 1. The model here must have had:

επιτροπευοντος
ποντιου πειλατου της ιουδαιας
[και τετραρχουντος της γαλιλαιας]
ηρωδου φιλιππου δε του αδελφου αυτου
τετραρχουντος της ιτουριας

D omitted στ. 3, and thus got out of step with $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, which renders the omitted στ. In order to restore harmony, *D* wrote twice στ. 5, once at the end of f. 192 *b* and again at the beginning of f. 193 *b*.

iv. 16. The model appears to have had:

ελθων δε εις ναζαρεδ οπου ην
[τεθραμμενος εισηλθεν]
κατα το ειωθος εν τη ημερα των σαββατων

D omits στ. 2. $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ has:

ueniens autem in nazared ubi erat
nutricatus introibit secundum consuetudinem
in sabbato

Here the missing στ. is fused with στ. 3, while *in sabbato* (a shorter form of ἐν τῇ ἡμ. τῶν σαββ.) is put into the next στ. This is a curious case. Possibly *nutricatus introiuit* may have been inserted from a Latin source. Cf. Mk. xv. 36.

Lk. xvi. 7. The model of *D* must have had:

> *επειτα τω ετερω ειπεν [συ δε ποσον*
> *οφειλεις ο δε ειπεν] εκατον κορους*

D omits *σὺ δὲ . . . εἶπεν*, which is rendered by $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, and fuses the two *στίχοι* into one. The result is that *D* has one *στίχος* less in the page than $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

Mk. xv. 36. The model of *D* may have had:

> *και δραμων εις και πλησας σφογγον*
> *οξους επιθεις καλαμω*
> *[εποτιζεν αυτον λεγων]*

D omits *στ.* 3. $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ has:

> et adcurrit unus et plena spongia
> aceto et potum dabat ei dicens

Here *στ.* 3 is rendered, but the words *ἐπιθεὶς καλάμῳ* have disappeared, and *στ.* 2 and 3 are fused. I regard this case with some doubt, since the translator of Mk. had before him a Latin MS. of the $\mathfrak{L}^{bff}$ type. He may, therefore, have taken the rendering of *στ.* 3 from this source, putting it in place of *ἐπιθεὶς καλάμῳ*.

(b) *Corruptions from adjacent στίχος peculiar to D.*

Jn. xv. 20. *D* has:

> *τους λογους ους εγω ειπον υμειν*
> *ουκ εστιν μου δουλος μειζων του κῡ αυτου*

μου in *στ.* 2 should come after *λόγους* in *στ.* 1. $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ does not render the word in either *στ.*

xvii. 13–14

> *ινα εχωσιν την χαραν την εμην*
> *πεπληρωμενην εν αυτοις εγω δε*
> *εδωκα τον λογον σου εν αυτοις*

ἐν in *στ.* 3 (*om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) is introduced from *στ.* 2.

Lk. viii. 41. Here Scrivener ascribes to *D*:

> *και ελθων ανηρ γης πεσων*
> *ουτος αρχων της συναγωγης πεσων*

Here D^1 wrote in *στ.* 1 *συναγωγης πεσων*, from *στ.* 2, in place of *ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰάειρος*, which is rendered by $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

Mk. xiv. 31

> *εαν μη δεη συναποθανειν σοι*
> *ου μη σε απαρνησομαι*

μή in *στ.* 1 is an error for *με* (so $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$), due to the presence of *μή* in *στ.* 2.

xvi. 3

> *και ελεγον προς εαυτους· τις ημιον αποκυλισει*
> *τον λιθον απο της θυρας του μνημιου*

ημιον in *στ.* 1 is an error for *ἡμῖν* (so $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$), due to *-ημιου* in *στ.* 2.

Acts vi. 7–8. Scrivener ascribes to D^1 the reading:

> *πολυς τε οχλος των ιερεων υπηκουον α τη πιστι*
> *στεφανος δε πληρης χαριτος και δυναμεως*

In his note upon the passage he says that after *α* in *στ.* 1 a letter has been erased, probably *ν*. The facsimile presents nothing to my eyes except a smudge, but I suspect that the second letter was *μ*, i. e. *αμ* was introduced from *δυνάμεως* in the next line.

xi. 19. *D* has:

οι μεν ουν διασπαρεντες απο της θλειψεως
της γενομενης απο του στεφανου

ἀπό in *στ.* 2 is an error for *ἐπί* (*sub* 𝔏[d]), due to *ἀπό* in *στ.* 1.

(c) *Doublets peculiar to D.*

Lk. xxiii. 40 ου φοβη συ
τον θ̄ν̄ οτι εν τω αυτω κριματι ει
και ημεις εσμεν

εἶ (*om.* 𝔏[d]) and *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν* are variants which are combined in *D*.

Mk. x. 19. *D* has:

μη μοιχευσης μη πορνευσης μη κλεψης
ne adulteres, ne occidas, ne fureris.

μὴ πορνεύσῃς is a variant for *μὴ μοιχεύσῃς*, which has taken the place of *μὴ φονεύσῃς* in *D*.

Acts ii. 14 τοτε σταθεις δε ο πετρος
cum stetisset autem petrus

τότε and *δέ* are variants.

ετων γαρ ην πλειονων .μ̄. ην ο ανθρωπος
annorum autem erat plurimum XL his (= is) homo

34 οσοι γαρ κτητορες ησαν χωριων
η οικειων υπηρχον

ἦσαν and *ὑπῆρχον* (*om.* 𝔏[d]) are variants.

xx. 7 εν τε τη μια πρωτη των σαββατων
in una autem sabbati

μιᾷ and *πρώτῃ* are variants.

To these may be added combinations of *καί* and *τε*, e. g. ii. 3, *και εκαθισαν τε*. Other examples are iv. 4, vii. 54. In xvi. 38 *αυτοισοι* (*om.* 𝔏[d]) appears to be a conflation of variants, probably *αὐτοῖς* and *τοῖς*.

(iii) Errors peculiar to 𝔏[d].

(a) *Omissions of στίχοι.*

When the original scribe perceived that he had omitted a *στ.* on the Latin side and so got out of step with the Greek, he employed one of two methods to restore the order. The first of these was to insert the missing *στίχος* later on with Greek numerals to show the proper sequence. The simplest case of this is Lk. xxii. 68:

.*β*. respondetis mihi aut dimittetis
.*α*. credetis si interrogauero non

In others there is an interval between the numerals. In Lk. xix. 47 the order is .α.+interval of 2 στίχοι+.β., in xi. 26, α, γ+2 στίχοι+β, in viii. 44, α, γ+8 στίχοι+β, in vi. 37, α, δ+4 στίχοι+β, γ. One instance of this method occurs in Acts, xxi. 6:

> α et cum salutassemus inuicem
> γ reuersi uero quisque ad sua

The lower part of the page, in which the missing στ. must have occurred with the mark β, is lost, as well as the Greek side.

Elsewhere another method was employed. Thus Mt. v. 32, where *D* has:

> *παρεκτος λογου πορνειας*
> *ποιει αυτην μοιχευθηναι*

$\mathfrak{L}^d$ omits στ. 2. In *v.* 34 the writer perceived that the Greek and Latin had ceased to correspond, and restored order by breaking up a single στίχος of the Greek into two on the Latin side. He did not himself add the missing στ. in *v.* 32, but this was subsequently done by a corrector (*G*).

Mt. xvii. 25, where *D* has:

> *και εισελθοντι εις την οικειαν*
> *προεφθασεν αυτον ο ιη̅ς λεγων*

$\mathfrak{L}^d$ compresses the two στ. into one. The proper order is not restored until ten στίχοι later (*v.* 27), where two στίχοι in *D* are rendered by three in $\mathfrak{L}^d$.

Mk. viii. 31, where *D* has:

> *και αποκτανθηναι*
> *και μετα τρεις ημερας αναστηναι*

$\mathfrak{L}^d$ omits στ. 1. The order is not restored until twelve στίχοι later (*v.* 34), where a single στίχος of *D* is expanded into two in $\mathfrak{L}^d$. The loss of a στίχος in *v.* 31 was not noticed.

(b) *Transposition of* στίχοι *in* $\mathfrak{L}^d$.

Acts xvii. 17. *D* has:

> *και τοις εν τη αγορα κατα πασαν ημεραν*
> *προς τους παρατυχοντας*

$\mathfrak{L}^d$ inverts the order. The error was left uncorrected.

(c) *Corruptions from adjacent* στίχος *peculiar to* $\mathfrak{L}^d$.

Errors of this kind are so frequent that only a selection can be given, e. g.:

Mt. xvii. 22 dixit eis ih̅s incipiet filius hominis
tradi in manus hominusm

The writer looked back to *-is* at the end of στ. 1. For *hominusm* cf. *infra* (d).

xix. 8. *D* has:

> *επετρεψεν υμειν μωυσης*
> *απολυσαι τας γυναικας υμων*

$\mathfrak{L}^d$ renders:

> dimisit uobis moyses
> dimittere uxores uestras

Here *dimisit* in στ. 1 is an error for *permisit*, due to *dimittere* in στ. 2.

Jn. xiii. 20 amen amen dico uobis qui accipit me
quemcumque misero me accipit

Me in στ. 1 is taken from στ. 2.

Acts v. 36 esse quendam magnum ipsorum
cui adsensum est numeri uirorum
quasi quagringentorum

In στ. 1 *ipsum* (ἑαυτόν) has been assimilated to the termination of στ. 2 and 3.

xi. 2–3 quia erant de circumcisione fratres iudicantes
ad eum dicentes
quia introisti ad uiros praeputia habentes

In στ. 1 *iudicantes* stands for *iudicabant* (διεκρίνοντο).

xiii. 43 qui loquentes cum illis
persuadentes eis permanere in gratia dī

In στ. 2 *persuadentes* stands for *-ebant*.

xiv. 17 imbrens dans et tempora fructifera
implens ciuo et iucunditate

The *n* in *imbrens* comes from *implens*.

I take separately an interesting case mentioned by Ropes, xxi. 16, where *D* (+𝔏[d]) omits συνῆλθον δὲ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν (cf. p. xxxiii). Two lines further on for οὗτοι δὲ ἤγαγον (*D*) 𝔏[d] has *simulque adduxerunt*. Ropes says that *simul* 'appears to be a survival representing the συν- in συνῆλθον'. I take this to mean that in the missing στίχος of 𝔏[d] συνῆλθον was rendered by *simul uenerunt*.

(d) *Doublets in* 𝔏[d].

Jn. iv. 40, adpud, vii. 44, manums, Mk. iii. 15, ualetudinems, Acts i. 15, non omnium (= nominum, with hominum written above).

Doublets of this description are found in all Old-Latin MSS., e.g. in the palimpsest of Cicero *de Re Publica* and the oldest MSS. of Livy. They are especially frequent in 𝔏[b] and 𝔏[ff] (Evv.). So 𝔏[k] in Mt. xii. 4 has *panems*.

Jn. xvii. 23 ινα ωσιν τετελιωμενοι
ut sint perfecti consummati

xxi. 7 ην γαρ γυμνος και ηλατο
erat enim nudus et misit se et salibit

Acts i. 2 αχρι ης ημερας
ανελημφθη εντειλαμενος τοις αποστολοις
usque in eum diem
quem susceptus est quo praecepit apostolis

Quem and *quo* are variants.

viii. 4 διηλθον ευαγγελιζομενοι τον λογον
adnuntiabant euangelizantes uerbum

Adnuntiabant is a synonym for *euangelizantes* and has expelled a rendering of διῆλθον.

Acts xix. 39 δαιομε δε σου συνχωρησαι μοι
cuius rogo obsegro autem mihi

Rogo and *obsecro* are variants. (I pass over other corruptions here.)

There are a number of passages in Acts in which a variant has found its way into the wrong στίχος, e. g.:

iv. 24 οι δε ακουσαντες και επιγνοντες την του θ̄υ ενεργειαν
ομοθυμαδον ηραν φωνην προς τον θ̄υ
ad illi cum audissent et cognouissent dĩ uirtutem
unanimiter autem uocem leuauerunt ad dm̃

Autem in στ. 2 is a variant for *ad* (*at*) in στ. 1, probably due to confusion of *ad* (*at*) with the ancient nota *a̅t* for *autem*.

vii. 46 και ητησατο σκηνωμα ευρειν
τω οικω ιακωβ
et petiit tabernaculum inuenire
sedes domui iacob.

Sedes is a synonym for *tabernaculum* in στ. 1.

viii. 3 κατα τους οικους εισπορευομενος
συρων τε ανδρας και γυναικας
per singulas quae domos ingrediens
trahensque uiros et mulieres

Quae in στ. 1 is a variant for *que* in στ. 2.

xii. 10 και εξελθοντες κατεβησαν τους .ζ̄. βαθμους
και προσηλθαν ρυμην μιαν
et cum exissent descenderunt septem grados
et processerunt gradum unum

Gradum seems to come from *gradus*, a correction for *grados*. It has taken the place of *uicum* (ῥύμην) in στ. 2.

xiv. 22 επιστηριζοντες τας ψυχας των μαθητων
παρακαλουντες τε εμμενειν τη πιστει
confirmantes enim animas discipulorum
exhortantes ut permanerent in fidem

Enim in στ. 1 is a translation of τε (confused with δέ)[1] in στ. 2.

xv. 38 παυλος δε ουκ εβουλετο λεγων
τον αποστησαντα απ αυτων απο παμφυλιας
paulus autem nolebat dicens hiis
qui discesserunt ab eis a pamphylia.

Hiis in στ. 1 is a variant for *eis* in στ. 2.

xviii. 21 ποιησαι εις ιεροσολυμα ανα[καμψ]ω προς υμας
του θ̄υ θελοντος ανηχθη απο του εφεσου
facere hierosolymis iter et reuerti ad uos
dō uolente redie ab epheso

[1] For *enim* = δέ cf. Salonius, *Vitae Patrum*, p. 343.

Redie (= *-ire*) in στ. 2 is a variant for *reuerti* in στ. 1. I pass over other corruptions.

xix. 14 εθος ειχαν τους τοιουτους εξορκιζειν
και εισελθοντες προς τον δαιμονιζομενον
ηρξαντο επικαλεισθαι το ονομα λεγοντες
consuetudinem habebant apud eos exorcizare
et introierunt adimplentes
coeperunt inuocare nomen dicentes

In στ. 2 *adimpletos* has been changed to *-entes* on account of *-entes* in στ. 3. *Apud* in στ. 1 should come before *adimpletos* in στ. 2. For the use of *adimpletus* in this sense cf. Acts v. 3 (*adimplevit satanas cor tuum* 𝕷ᵈ), also Cyprian, *De lapsis* 26, *multi cotidie immundis spiritibus adimplentur*, Herm. *vulg. mand.* xi, *diabolus adimplet eum spiritu suo.*

ib. 26 ου μονον εως εφεσιου
αλλα και σχεδον πασης ασιας
quia non solum ipsius ephesi
sed paenae omnis asiae

Ipsius in στ. 1 is very odd. It is to be noticed that in στ. 2 *D* omits τῆς (Γ, *cett.*) before Ἀσίας. As in Acts 𝕷ᵈ constantly translates the article by *ipse*, it appears probable that *ipsius* in στ. 1 stands for the missing τῆς in στ. 2.

IV. Graecisms in 𝕷ᵈ

Before treating this subject it is necessary to clear out of the way a fact from which very erroneous conclusions have been drawn, viz. the occasional use of Latin letters in *D* and of Greek letters in 𝕷ᵈ.

Scrivener, who had previously laid down the position that 'a copy of the Greek scriptures, furnished with a Latin version, would most likely be written among a people with whom Latin was vernacular' (p. xxx), goes on to say that 'the same inference may also be drawn from the insertion of Latin letters in the Greek text', while he explains the insertion of Greek letters in the Latin as due to 'the mere strangeness of the task'.

The instances which he gives of Latin letters on the Greek side are Mt. xi. 5 τυbλοι (= τυφλοι), Jn. v. 38 απεσταlκεν, f. 296ᵇ μαρcον (in title), Mk. xii. 43 gαζοφυλακιον, f. 469ᵇ πραξ apost. For the opposite phenomenon he quotes *y* for *u* in *illym* (Mt. xv. 22) and *cyminum* (Mt. xxiii. 23), Lk. iii. 23, where the scribe first wrote ιωσηφ on the Latin side as well as on the Greek and then corrected his error, ib. 37 aenox (= αινωχ), vi. 42 üpocrita (so xi. 39, Mk. vii. 6), Mk. vii. 3, where the scribe first wrote τας χειρ on the Latin side and then substituted *manus*, Mk. ix. 7 κarissimus, and Acts viii. 9 magiκα. In two other passages (Acts xv. 20 and 38) he is of opinion that α was originally written instead of *a*, but this does not appear from the facsimile. He does not mention a somewhat curious case which I have observed: viz. Jn. xx. 24 (f. 179):

θωμας δε εις των .ιβ. λεγομενος
thomas autem unus ex i $\overline{\text{xii}}$ qui dicitur

Here i before xii comes from the Greek numeral .ιβ.

It will be seen that the intrusion of Greek letters into the Latin is more frequent and in some cases more striking (Jn. xx. 24, Lk. iii. 23, Mk. vii. 3) than that of Latin into the Greek. Scrivener's ' inference ', therefore, quoted above, is a clear case of special pleading. As a matter of fact such errors are of little or no importance, so far as the provenance of *D* is concerned, since they would easily occur in any bilingual MS. I illustrate from the Laudianus (*E*), which on f. 78^v has paralytiκουc | *παραλελυμενος* and on f. 116^r ego | ego. I regard all such vagaries as of small importance and am quite ready to set off one class against the other.

Graecisms classified under main heads

1. Greek words in 𝔏^d

The chief cases are:

adynatus (*ἀδύνατος*) Acts xiv. 8, ἁ.λ.
ana Lk. ix. 3, ἁ.λ., except in medical writers.
anetius (*ἀναίτιος*) Acts xvi. 37, ἁ.λ.
aporia Lk. xxi. 25.
aporior Lk. xxiv. 4.
basiliscus Jn. iv. 46. So 𝔏^a (Verc.).
echo Acts ii. 2, ἁ.λ. in this sense (= *sonus*).
ellas Acts xx. 2.
promeleto Lk. xxi. 14.
spermologus Acts xvii. 18, ἁ.λ.
tristegum Acts xx. 9. So 𝔏^g.

It will be observed that nearly all of these occur in Lk. or Acts.

2. Greek collocation retained in 𝔏^d

Acts x. 26	*ο δε πετρος ηγειρεν αυτον λεγων* uero petrus leuabit eum dicens
xi. 2	*ο μεν ουν πετρος δια ικανου χρονου* quidem ergo petrus per multo tempore
xvii. 10	*οι δε αδελφοι ευθεως δια νυκτος* uero fratres statim per noctem
ib. 16	*εν δε ταις αθηναις εκδεχομενου αυτου του παυλου* uero athenis expectante eo paulum
xviii. 8	*ο δε αρχισυναγωγος κρισπος* uero archisynagogus crispus
ib. 18	*ο δε παυλος ετι προσμινας ημερας ειкανας* uero paulus adhuc memoratus dies plurimos

This practice is confined to Acts.

3. Confusion of Greek terminations

(a) 𝔏[d] *misinterprets 2 pers. plur. pres. ind. as imper.*

Mt. x. 31 μη ουν φοβεισθαι· πολλων στρουθειων
διαφερετε υμεις
ne ergo timueritis multorum passerum
superponite uos

Jn. viii. 38 υμεις ουν α εωρακατε
παρα τω πατρι υμων ταυτα ποιειτε
uos ergo quae uidistis
aput patrem uestrum haec facite

Lk. xxi. 30 γεινωσκεται ηδη οτι εγγυς ηδη το θερος
scitote quia prope iam aestas

The same error occurs in *v.* 31.

(b) *Imperative substituted for 2 pers. plur. fut. ind.*

Acts ii. 38 και λημψεσθαι την δωρεαν του αγιου π̄ν̄ς
et accipite gratiam sanctum spm̄

(c) *Imperative substituted for infin.*

Acts xiv. 16 πορευεσθαι ταις οδοις αυτων
ambulate uias suas

xxi. 36 κραζον αναιρεισθαι αυτον
clamans tollite eum

(d) *Infin. substituted for imper.*

Mk. xiv. 36 παρενεγκε τουτο
το ποτηριον απ εμου
transferre
hunc calicem a me

(e) *Indic. substituted for infin.*

Mk. xii. 38 και ασπασμους εν ταις αγοραις ποιεισθαι
et salutationes in foro facitis

4. Greek constructions in 𝔏[d]

(a) *Genitive absolute for abl. abs.*

Lk. iii. 15 προσδοκωντος δε
του λαου και διαλογιζομενων παντων
expectantes (= -te) autem
populo et cogitantium omnium

ix. 43 παντων δε
θαυμαζοντων επι πασιν οις εποιει
omnium autem
mirantium in omnibus quae faciebat

Lk. xii. 1 πολλων δε
οχλων συμπεριεχοντων κυκλω
multis autem
turbis adstantium circa

xix. 11 ακουοντων δε αυτων
audientium autem eorum

xxi. 5 και τινων λεγοντων
et quorundam dicentium

ib. 25-6 και απορια ηχουσης θαλασσης
και σαλου αποψυχοντων ανθρωπωι
et aporia sonante mare
et s[a]lo deficientium hominum

ib. 28 ερχομενων δε τουτων γεινεσθαι
incipientium autem horum fieri

xxii. 55 και περικαθισαντων
εκαθητο και ο πετρος μετ αυτων
et circumsedentium
sedebat et petrus cum eis

xxiv. 31 και προσεδιδου αυτοις λαβοντων δε
αυτων τον αρτον απ αυτου
et dabat illis accipientium autem
eorum panem ab eo

ib. 36 ταυτα δε
αυτων λαλουντων αυτος εσταθη
haec autem
eorum loquentium ipse stetit

ib. 41 ετι δε απιστουντων αυτων
απο της χαρας και θαυμαζοντων
adhuc autem non credentibus eis
a gaudio et mirantium

(b) *Mixture of genitive and ablative.*

Mt. xxiii. 27 εσωθεν δε γεμι οστεων νεκρων
και πασης ακαθαρσειας
intus autem est plenum ossib. mortuorum
et totius immunditiae

Lk. vii. 21 εθεραπευεν
πολλους απο νοσων και μαστειγων
και πονηρων πνευματων
curabit
multos ab infirmitatibus et plagis
et iniquorum spirituum

xii. 4	*μη φοβηθηται απο των αποκτενοντων* *το σωμα την δε ψυχην μη δυναμενων* *αποκτειναι μηδε εχοντων περισσον* non timere ab his qui occidunt corpus animam autem non possunt occidere neque habentium amplius
xx. 46	*απο των γραμματεων των θελοντων* *περιπατειν εν στολαις και φιλουντων* *ασπασμους* a scribis qui uolunt ambulare in stolis et amantium salutationes
xxiv. 27	*και ην αρξαμενος απο μωσεως και παντων* *των προφητων ερμηνευειν* et erat incipiens a mosen et omnium propheetarum interpraetari
Mk. ix. 42	*ενα των μεικρων τουτων των πιστιν* *εχοντων* unum ex his pusillis fidem habentium
xii. 13	*και αποστελλουσιν τινας* *των φαρισαιων και των ηρωδιανων* et mittunt quosdam pharisaeorum et herodianis
Acts iii. 24	*παντες οι προφηται απο σαμουηλ* *και των κατεξης* omnis prophetae a samuel et eorum qui ordine fuerunt
xi. 24	*και πληρης πνς αγιου και πιστεως* et plenus spō sancto et fidei
xix. 13	*επεχειρησαν δε τινες εκ των περιερχομενων* *ιουδαιων εξορκιστων ονομαζειν* adgressi sunt quidam ex circumuenientibus iudaeis exorcistarum nominare

(c) *The influence of Greek idiom upon the Latin may be shown by abnormal constructions of* ut *with the indicative and infinitive, viz.*:

ut + ind.

Jn. iii. 16	ut filium suum unicum dedit

D is here lacking. Γ, *cett.* give ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν.

xiv. 3	*ινα οπου ειμι εγω και υμεις εσθαι* (= ἔσεσθε) ut ubi ego sum et uos eritis

ut + inf.

Mt. xviii. 6	*ινα κρεμασθη . . . . και καταποντισθη* ut suspendatur . . . . et demergi

The translator took *καταποντισθη* for an inf. and rendered accordingly.

Jn. viii. 9 αρξαμενοι απο των
πρεσβυτερων ωστε παντας εξελθειν
incipientes
a presbyteris uti omnes exire

Lk. v. 14 ωστε μηκετι
δυνασθαι αυτον φανερως εις πολιν
εισελθειν
ut non amplius
posse eum palam in ciuitatem
introire

Mk. iv. 1 ωστε αυτον εις το πλοιον ενβαντα
καθησται (= σθαι)
ita ut ipse in naui ascendens
sedere

Acts xiv. 1 εγενετο δε εν ικονιω κατα το αυτο
εισελθειν αυτον
contigit autem ut ichonio similiter
introire eos

xxii. 14 ds̄ patrum nostrorum praeordinauit te
ut cognosceris uoluntatem eius
et uidere iustum

D is here lacking. Γ, *cett.* have ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν προεχειρίσατό σε γνῶναι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰδεῖν τὸν δίκαιον.

In connexion with these cases we may compare:

Lk. xix. 11 δια το ειναι αυτον εγγυς ιερουσαλημ
και δοκειν
propter quod esset iuxta hierusalem
et putare

Mk. ix. 39 ουδεις γαρ εστιν
ος ποιησει δυναμιν επι τω ονοματι μου
και δυνησεται ταχυ κακολογησαι με
nemo est enim
qui faciat uirtutem in nomine meo
et poterit male loqui de me

The Greek future is retained in στ. 3.

Lk. xiv. 8 μηποτε
εντειμοτερος σου ηξει και ελθων
ο σε και αυτον καλεσας ερει σοι
ne forte
honorificentior te ueniet et ueniens
qui te et illum inuitauit dicet tibi

Here also the future indicatives are retained.

Before quitting this subject it may be well to add some examples where a Greek accusative is retained in an *ut* or *cum* clause.

Mt. xxiv. 24 ωστε πλανηθηναι
ει δυνατον και τους εκλεκτους
ut seducantur
si possibile est et electos

Lk. iv. 39 ωστε αναστασαν
αυτην διακονειν αυτοις
ut surgentem
eam ministraret eis

xi. 1 και εγενετο εν τω ειναι αυτον
εν τοπω τινι προσευχομενον
et factum est cum esset
in loco quodam orantem

(d) *Neuter plur. with verb in sing.*

Mt. xiii. 26 τοτε εφανη τα ζιζανια
tunc paruit zizania

xviii. 12 εαν γενηται τινι ανθρωπω
εκατον προβατα
si fuerit alicui homini
centum oues

Jn. iii. 21. 𝔏[d] has (*def. D*)
ut manifestetur opera eius
quoniam deo sunt operata

Γ, *cett.* give ἵνα φανερωθῇ αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα ὅτι ἐν θεῷ ἐστιν εἰργασμένα. It will be noticed that 𝔏[d] has the plural in στ. 2. A similar use of the verb in the singular after *opera* (plur.) occurs in v. 36 and ix. 3.

Mk. iv. 11 εκεινοις δε τοις εξω εν παραβολαις
παντα λεγεται
illis autem qui foris sunt in parabolis
omnia dicitur

(e) *Greek gender retained in* 𝔏[d].

Mt. x. 29 ουχι δυο στρουθια του ασσαριου πωλουνται
(cf. Lk xii. 6) και εν εξ αυτων ου πεσειται επι την γην
nonne duo passeres asse ueniunt
et unum ex his non cadet super terram

xx. 22 δυνασθαι το ποτηριον
πειειν ο εγω μελλω πεινειν
potestis calicem
bibere quod ego uiuiturus sum

xxiii. 35 παν αιμα δικαιον
εχχυννομενον επι της γης
omnis sanguis iustus
quod effunditur super terram

Mt. xxiv. 15 *οταν ουν ειδητε*
το βδελυγμα της ερημωσεως
. . . .
εστως
cum ergo uideritis
abominationem desolationis
. . . .
stans

xxv. 41 *εις το πυρ το αιωνιον*
ο ητοιμασεν ο πατηρ μου
in igne aeternum
quod praeparauit pater meus

Jn. x. 13–14 *ου μελει αυτω περι των*
προβατων εγω ειμι ο καλος ποιμην
και γεινωσκω τα εμα και γεινωσιν εμε τα εμα
cura ei non est de
ouibus ego sum bonus pastor
et cognosco mea et cognoscunt me meae

Lk. ii. 10 *ευαγγελιζομαι υμειν χαραν μεγαλην*
ητις εσται και παντι τω λαω
euangelizo uobis gaudium magnum
quae erit et omni populo

xii. 7 *αλλα και αι τριχες υμων πασαι της κεφαλης*
ηριθμημεναι εισιν
sed et capilli uestri omnes de capite
numeratae sunt

xv. 4 *τις ανθρωπος εξ υμων ος εξει*
εκατον προβατα και απολεση
εξ αυτων εν
qui ex uobis homo qui habet
centum oues et perdiderit
unum ex eis

ib. 12 *πατερ δος μοι το επιβαλλον μοι μερος*
pater da mihi quod me tanget partem

I have not included in this list some doubtful cases, e.g.:

Mt. xiii. 20 *ουτος εστιν ο τον λογον ακουων*
και ευθυς μετα χαρας λαμβανων αυτον
hic est qui uerbum audit
et continuo cum gaudio accipit eum

Lk. i. 20 *τοις λογοις μου οιτινες πλησθησονται*
uerbis meis qui complebuntur

since the vulgar form *uerbus* is found Jn. xxi. 23, Lk. iv. 32. So also in Mk. xiv. 58

οτι εγω καταλυσω τον ναον
quia ego destruam hunc templum

the vulgar form *templus* may have been used.

(f) *Greek double negative.*

I do not attach much importance to this, as it is not a rare idiom in O.-L. MSS. The examples in 𝔏^{d} are:

Mt. xxii. 16.
Jn. vi. 39, viii. 33, ix. 33, xi. 50, xiv. 30, xvi. 23.
Lk. xx. 40, xxii. 34.
Mk. xiv. 60.
Acts xvii. 29.

(g) *Translation of Greek article.*[1]

ὁ = *hic* in 𝔏^{d}. Mk. xiv. 58 τὸν ναόν] hunc templum

Acts ii. 39 ἡ ἐπαγγελία] haec repromissio: iv. 8 τοῦ λαοῦ] huius populi, 22 τὸ σημεῖον] hoc signum, 37 τὸ χρῆμα] hanc pecuniam: xi. 22 ὁ λόγος] hic sermo: xix. 23 περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ] de hac uia, 35 τοῦ διοπετοῦς] huius Iouis.

I have not included in this list instances of *hic mundus* (= ὁ κόσμος), of which I have noted 17 cases, all in Jn. This rendering is frequent in all O.-L. MSS. and requires separate treatment.

ὁ = *ille*. Lk. xxiv. 9 τοῖς ἕνδεκα] illis undecim, so 33 illos undecim.

Acts xx. 25 τὴν βασιλείαν] illud regnum. Cf. Acts iii. 10 ἐπὶ τῇ ὡραίᾳ πύλῃ] in porta illa pulchra, iv. 14 τὸν τεθεραπευμένον] illumque curatum.

ὁ = *is*. Acts iii. 25 τῆς διαθήκης] eius dispositionis: iv. 22 ὁ ἄνθρωπος] his (=is) homo: xvi. 19 τῆς παιδίσκης] eius puelles.

ὁ = *ipse* (23 exx.).

Acts iii. 14 τὸν ἅγιον] ipsum sanctum: v. 24 οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς] ipsi pontifices, 26 ὁ στρατηγός] ipse praetor: vii. 8 τὸν Ἰακώβ] ipsum Iacob, 13 τῷ Φαραώ] ipsi Pharao, 17 τῷ Ἀβραάμ] ipsi Abraham, 18 τοῦ Ἰωσήφ] ipsius Ioseph, 35 τὸν Μωυσῆν] ipsum Moysen, 43 τοῦ Μολόχ] ipsius Moloch, 48 ὁ ὕψιστος] ipse altissimus, 58 οἱ μάρτυρες] ipsi testes: viii. 9 ἐν τῇ πόλει] in ipsa ciuitate: x. 16 τὸ σκεῦος] ipsum uas, 21 τοὺς ἄνδρας] ipsos uiros: xi. 12 τοῦ ἀνδρός] ipsius uiri, 23 τῇ προθέσει] ipso proposito: xiii. 23 τῷ Ἰσραήλ] ipsi istrahel: xv. 33 πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστείλαντας] ad ipsos qui miserant: xvi. 25 οἱ δέσμιοι] ipsi uincti: xix. 30 τοῦ Παύλου] ipso paulo, 33 ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου] de ipsa turba: xx. 24 τὴν ψυχήν] ipsam animam. To these should be added xix. 26, where *ipsius* appears to represent τῆς which *D* omits in the next στ.

The first point which strikes the eye here is that nearly all the examples here given come from the Acts, including all the 23 cases of *ipse*. If we go on to examine the other O.-L. MSS. of Evv., another interesting fact emerges. This is that while only three examples of the *ille* type occur in 𝔏^{d}, it is quite common in them and in *vg*. I illustrate by the following figures for Evv.:

𝔏^{a} 17 exx., 𝔏^{b} 34, 𝔏^{c} 36, 𝔏^{e} 24, 𝔏^{f} 22, 𝔏^{ff} 33, 𝔏^{k} 4, 𝔏^{q} 11, *vg*. 16.

[1] Cf. Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata*, pp. 419–23.

The nearest approach to $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ is made by $\mathfrak{L}^{k}$, which contains only parts of Mt. and Mk. The others differ widely.

The examples of *ipse* = ὁ which I have noticed in Old-Latin MSS. of Evv. are: Jn. xviii. 2 τὸν τόπον] ipsum locum $\mathfrak{L}^{be}$: xx. 4 οἱ δύο] ipsi duo $\mathfrak{L}^{b}$: Lk. xi. 46 τοῖς φορτίοις] ipsas sarcinas $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: xxii. 11 τῆς οἰκίας] domus ipsius $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: Mk. ii. 28 τοῦ σαββάτου] ipsius sabbati $\mathfrak{L}^{a}$: v. 23 ἡ γυνή] ipsa mulier $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: vi. 22 τῆς Ἡρῳδιάδος] ipsius Herodiadis $\mathfrak{L}^{a}$.

I have not observed any cases in the other Old-Latin MSS. of Acts ($\mathfrak{L}^{eghp}$) or in *vg*.

Rönsch (p. 423) gives a number of instances from the O.T. and says that the use is especially frequent to the titles to the Psalms, e.g. *ipsi David*.

The practice varies a good deal in other translations from the Greek. I did not notice any attempt to render the article in the Latin Irenaeus or in the Epistle of Barnabas. In the Epistle of Clement I found five cases of *ille*. Tertullian and Cyprian use *ille* frequently. In the Shepherd of Hermas I noticed the following cases:

ille	hic	ipse	is
90	25	5	13

In the Latin version of Theodorus of Mopsuestia *ille* is very frequent, while *ipse* is common, especially in such phrases as *ex ipsis rebus* (= ἀπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων).

In the Mulomedicina Chironis, translated from Greek sources by a very ignorant person (cent. iv), *hic*, *ille*, *ipse* are very frequent. For *ipse* I quote e.g. § 64, (ed. Niedermann):

'sub *ipsum* palpebrum intus scalpello plagam directam das secus *ipsos* pilos, ut palpebrum foris versus laxes. Deinde ut foris versus *ipsum* palpebrum . . . precides.'

The practice of Aetheria is very similar. Löfstedt (p. 64) quotes a sentence in which *ipse* (= ὁ) occurs six times. She also uses *ille* very frequently in the same way. In her case the question of Greek influence does not arise. It may be remarked that in the late 'Romance of Alexander' *ille*, *ipse*, *iste* are extremely frequent as substitutes for an article.

The general conclusion to which these facts seem to point is that the use of demonstrative pronouns to represent the article was essentially popular, that of *ipse* being especially vulgar.

(h) *Rendering of Greek article by Latin relative clause.*

In place of the Greek article a relative clause is very frequently employed by Latin translators, e.g. τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας] *ea quae sunt de regno*. Sometimes the verb is omitted, e.g. οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ] *qui cum ipso*. These are simple cases and need no discussion. Attention, however, may be called to some singular tangles into which $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ is led by his attempts to render the article. The most striking cases occur in Lk. and Acts, e.g.:

Lk. i. 65 εγενετο
φοβος μεγας επι παντας τους
περιοικουντας αυτον

factum est
timor magnus super omnes qui
uicinos eius

ib. 79 *τοις εν σκοτει και σκια θανατου*
καθημενοις
his qui in tenebris et umbra mortis
sedentibus

v. 27 *τον επακολουθουντα*
αυτω οχλον εδιδασκεν
qui autem sequebatur
eum populus docebat

vii. 32 *ομοιοι*
εισιν τοις παιδιοις τοις εν τη αγορα
καθημενοις και προσφωνουσιν
similes
sunt infantibus qui in foro
sedentibus et adloquentibus

xii. 5 *τον μετα το αποκτειναι*
εχοντα εξουσιαν
quem post occiderit
habentem potestatem

Acts xiii. 1 *ησαν δε εν αντιοχεια*
κατα την ουσαν εκκλησιαν
erant autem in antiochia
aput quem erat ecclesiam

ib. 10 *ου πανση διαστρεφων τας οδους κ̅υ̅*
τας ουσας ευθειας
non cessas euertere uias domini
quas sunt rectas

ib. 32 *και ημεις υμας ευαγγελιζομεθα*
την προς τους πατερας ημων
γενομενην επαγγελιαν
et nos uos euangelizamus
eam quae patres nostros
factam pollicitationem

In this connexion we may notice various attempts to render the Greek construction of the art. with the infinitive. The most remarkable case is Lk. xxiv. 15:

και εγενετο εν τω ομειλειν αυτους
et factus est in eo fabulari eos

I have found no parallel to this remarkable Graecism in other O.-L. translations.

On other occasions ἐν τῷ or ἐπὶ τῷ is translated by *in eo cum* (*dum*, *quod*) e.g.:

Lk. i. 21 *εθαυμαζον επι τω χρονιζειν αυτον*
mirabantur in eo quod tardaret

Lk. v. 1 εν τω τον οχλον επικεισθαι αυτω
in eo dum populus super eum esset

Similar constructions occur in Lk. ix. 34, xi. 27, xviii. 35: Acts iii. 26, iv. 30, viii. 6.

(i) *Relative attraction.*

Jn. vii. 31 μη πλεονα
σημεια ποιησει ων ουτος ποιει
numquid plura
signa faciet quorum hic facit

xvii. 9 ου περι του
κοσμου ερωτω αλλα περι ων εδωκας μοι
non pro hoc
mundo rogo sed de quibus dedisti mihi

Lk. i. 1 διηγησιν περι των
πεπληροφορημενων εν ημειν
narrationem de his quibus
conpleta sunt in nobis

ii. 20 επι πασιν οις ηκουσαν και ιδον
in omnibus quibus audierunt et uiderunt

iii. 19 παντων ων εποιησεν πονηρων
omnibus quibus fecit malis

xiii. 17 εχαιρεν εν πασιν οις εθεωρουν
gaudebat in omnibus quibus uidebant

xix. 37 χαιροντες αινειν τον θ̅ν̅ περι παντων
ων ειδον
gaudentes laudare dm̄ de omnibus
quibus uiderunt

xxiv. 25 επι πασιν
οις ελαλησαν οι προφηται
in omnibus
quibus locuti sunt profetae

Acts i. 2 αχρι ης ημερας
ανελημφθη
in eum diem
quem susceptus est

It is unnecessary to discuss here omissions of the antecedent before a relative, since these are fairly frequent in other O.-L. MSS. I give as examples:

Mt. xxiii. 31 υιοι εστε
των φονευσαντων τους προφητας
fili estis
qui occiderunt prophetas

Jn. iv. 34 ινα ποιησω το θελημα του πεμψαντος με
ut faciam uoluptatem qui me misit

Lk. iii. 7 — ελεγεν δε τοις εκπορευομενοις
dicebat autem qui egrediebantur

Acts iv. 34 — και φεροντες τειμας των πιπρασκομενων
et adferebant praetia quae ueniebant

Other cases will be found in Mt. v. 42 : Jn. v. 10, vi. 39, xiii. 20 : Lk. i. 45, vi. 4, viii. 4, ix. 61, x. 36, xiv. 10, xxiii. 25 : Acts iv. 21, vi. 1, xvi. 10, 13, xvii. 11, 28, xviii. 27, xx. 20, xxii. 11. The construction does not seem to occur in Mk.

It will be seen from these lists that Graecisms, some of them striking, e.g. the retention of the infinitive after *ut* (= ὥστε), are found throughout Evv. and Acts. The most abnormal cases, however, occur chiefly in Lk. and Acts. Thus the use of the Greek genitive abs. in place of the Latin ablative abs. is confined to Lk. (11 exx.). The most remarkable peculiarity of 𝔏ᵈ in Acts is the continual endeavour to render the Greek article by a demonstrative pronoun, especially *ipse* (23 exx.). The six cases in Acts where *vero* (= ὁ δέ) or *quidem* (= ὁ μέν) comes at the beginning of a sentence are somewhat singular. It is also in Acts that the most striking transliterations of Greek words are found.

I now add a few cases where the rendering in 𝔏ᵈ shows curious ignorance of Greek:

Jn. xii. 42 — ομως μεντοι
και εκ των αρχοντων πολλοι επιστευσαν

𝔏ᵈ renders ὅμως by *facile*. This is due to a confusion of ὅμως with ὁμοῦ, which is used to qualify numbers, e.g. Dem. *F. L.*, § 251 ἀπὸ Σόλωνος δὲ ὁμοῦ διακόσιά ἐστιν ἔτη. So in Latin *facile* is employed, e.g. Cic. *Verr.* ii. 35 *hereditas ad HS facile triciens.*

xxi. 25 — οιμαι τον κοσμον χωρησε (= σαι)
facile puto mundum capere

Scrivener (p. xlii) strangely calls *facile puto* an 'elegant rendering' of οἶμαι. It appears to combine two variants, viz. οἶμαι and ὁμοῦ.

Lk. ii. 8 — ησαν εν τη χαρα (= χω-) ταυτη αγραυλουντες
erant in regione illa cantantes

𝔏ᵈ confuses ἀγραυλεῖν ('live in the fields') with αὐλεῖν.

Acts xiii 46 — και ουκ αξιους κρεινατε εαυτους
et non dignos iudicastis eos

The translator did not realize that ἑαυτούς could be used for the 2nd person as well as for the 3rd.

xiv. 9 — υπαρχων εν φοβω
possidens in timore

This strange translation of ὑπάρχων is due to the use of ὑπάρξεις (ii. 45) and τὰ ὑπάρχοντα (iv. 32) for property.

Acts xiv. 16 ο εν ταις παρωχημεναις
γενεαις ειασε κατα (= παντα) τα εθνη
πορευεσθαι ταις οδοις αυτων
qui in praeteritis
saeculis sanauit omnes gentes
ambulate uias suas

𝔏[d] has confused the 1 aor. of ἐάω with that of ἰάομαι.

xvii. 18 τι αν θελη ο σπερμολογος ουτος λεγειν
quid nunc uellit spermologus hic dicere

ib. 20 τι αν θελοι ταυτα ειναι
quid nunc sibi uellint haec esse

The translation of ἄν by *nunc* is peculiar to these two passages. It may, however, be noticed that in Mt. xi. 21 and Lk. x. 13 πάλαι ἄν is rendered by *olim iam*. Elsewhere 𝔏[d] translates ἄν by *utique*. I have not found *nunc* or *iam* for ἄν in other O.-L. MSS.

xviii. 27 συνκατανευσαντος δε αυτου
redeunte autem eo

𝔏[d] connected the verb with νέομαι (νέω) instead of with νεύω. The sense required here is 'consented'.

To these may be added a curious case in Acts iv. 14.

τον ανθρωπον βλεποντες
συν αυτων (= οις) εστωτα τον τεθεραπευμενον
hominem quoque conspicientes
cum ipsis stantem illumque curatum

𝔏[d] here separates τε- from the perf. pass. part. and renders it by *que*.

I have restricted myself to passages which indicate a faulty knowledge of Greek words on the part of 𝔏[d]. There are a number of cases in which the translator misses the construction, but these may be due to want of sense rather than to ignorance of the language. I illustrate by a single example:

Lk. xviii. 17 ος αν μη
δεξηται την βασιλειαν του θ̅υ̅ ως
παιδιον
quicumque non
acceperit regnum d̅e̅i̅ sicut
infantem

It is to be observed that the errors in this list are drawn from those parts of 𝔏[d] which contain the most frequent and striking Graecisms. The ignorance of the translator is most noticeable in Acts.

V. Vocabulary of 𝔏[d]

The test of Graecisms, applied in the preceding pages, has shown a connexion in Evv. between Jn. and Lk. which is not shared by Mt. and Mk. The relation of Acts to Jn. and Lk. has not yet been determined. A flood of light is thrown on all these subjects by a well-known test, viz. the choice of synonyms in

different parts of $\mathfrak{L}^d$. This method of inquiry is familiar to students of O.-L. texts, who have generally used it to draw distinctions between so-called 'African' and 'European' Latin. I do not desire to discuss this matter here, but would say briefly that the theory on which it rests is now regarded as baseless by philological scholars. I would advise hunters after 'Africisms' to read and ponder over the remarks of Löfstedt upon this mare's-nest (*Phantasiegebilde*).[1]

As the subject is somewhat complicated, I will state at once the conclusions at which I have arrived.

(*a*) $\mathfrak{L}^d$ in Acts is the work of a separate translator.

(*b*) There is considerable similarity between $\mathfrak{L}^d$ in Jn. and Lk.

(*c*) Mk. differs sharply from other parts of Evv., including Mt. The vocabulary of $\mathfrak{L}^d$ in this Gospel shows that the translator made extensive use of an O.-L. MS. resembling $\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$ (Corbeiensis) or $\mathfrak{L}^b$ (Veronensis).

(*d*) The translator of the Acts made still more extensive use of an O.-L. MS. resembling $\mathfrak{L}^g$ (Gigas), the readings of which are often combined with a literal translation of the Greek.

(1) Before dealing with vocabulary it will be convenient to clear the way by applying a test which proves conclusively that $\mathfrak{L}^d$ in Acts is the work of a separate person. This is the use of *nomina sacra.*

(*a*) I take first *dominus*. Of this there are two types in O.-L. MSS., viz. *dm̃s* and *dñs*. In $\mathfrak{L}^d$ the first of these is found in Evv. in 221 cases (Mt. 55, Jn. 55, Lk. 91, Mk. 20). The second occurs in 12 cases, all of which, except Lk. xxiii. 40, are in Mt.

In Acts, on the other hand, I have only observed one example of the *dm̃s* type (iii. 20). Apart from this, the *dñs* type is invariable (95 exx.).

(*b*) *Deus*. Here also there are two methods; either the word is written in full, often with a mark above it, or the contractions *ds̄*, &c. are employed. In $\mathfrak{L}^d$ the figures for the full forms in Evv. are as follows :

	Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.	
deus	1	2	0	0 =	3
deum	0	2	0	0 =	2
deī	21	23	68	14 =	126
deō	1	13	6	0 =	20
	23	40	74	14 =	151

Those for the *ds̄* type are :

	Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.	
ds̄	10	15	19	16 =	60
dm̄	9	8	25	3 =	45
dī	7	0	0	16 =	23
dō	1	0	1	1 =	3
	27	23	45	36 =	131

[1] *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, pp. 18, 257–8.

The full forms are rare in the nom. (Mt. i. 23, Jn. vi. 27, xx. 28) and acc., (Jn. vi. 36, x. 33), but greatly preponderate in the gen. and dat. (abl.) It is to be noticed that *dī* does not occur in Jn. or Lk.

In the Acts I have noticed two cases where *dēō* occurs (vii. 40, x. 4), but in the first of these it is a scribal error for *deos*. Elsewhere the *ds̄* type is invariable. The figures are:

ds̄	58 exx.
dm̄i	20 „
dī	38 „
dō̄	20 „
	136

There is no example of *dēī* in Acts, as against 126 in Evv. On the other hand, there are 20 of *dō̄* in Acts as against 3 in Evv.

(2) Further tests are furnished by differences in vocabulary. I take first some simple cases:

(*a*) Renderings of δοξάζω and δόξα. (The chief interest lies in *clarifico*, *claritas*, which are supposed to be 'African'.)

		Evv.	Acts
δοξάζω	= clarifico	0	4
	= glorifico	21	0
	= honorifico (-oro)	15	0
δόξα	= claritas	0	3
	= gloria	37	1

		Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.	Acts
(*b*) ἀρχιερεύς	= pontifex	0	0	0	0	7
	= princeps sacerdotum	22	6	16	2	0
	= summus sacerdos	0	0	0	18	0

It will be noticed that *pontifex* is peculiar to Acts and *summus sacerdos* to Mk.

(*c*) In Evv. the usual rendering of ἀποκτείνω, ἀναιρῶ is *occido* (40 exx.) as against *interficio* (6 exx.). In Acts there are 11 cases of *interficio* as against 2 of *occido*.

I now pass on to other statistics which concern more complicated points, especially the vocabulary of 𝔏ᵈ in Mk.

(*d*) One of the best known tests is that afforded by the use of *quoniam*, *quia*, and *quod* as equivalents for ὅτι. The usual method is to restrict the inquiry to cases where ὅτι is used in Greek after verbs of saying. I prefer to extend it to all cases where ὅτι occurs, since a writer's practice appears to be the same throughout. It should be premised that *quod* is not frequent. The struggle is between *quoniam* and *quia*, the latter being generally predominant. G. Mayen, who gives elaborate statistics about the practice of various authors,[1] considers that a preference for *quoniam* is a mark of antiquity.

[1] *De particulis quod, quia, quoniam*, &c., 1889.

The statistics for $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ are:

	Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.	Acts
quoniam	22	152	102	23	17
quia	101	68	76	38	77
quod	5	14	1	18	6
	128	234	179	79	100

The chief point which here emerges is the preponderance of *quoniam* in Jn. and Lk. as compared with Mt. and Acts, which belong to the *quia* type. The figures for Mk. are interesting on account of the comparative frequency of *quod*. A curious light is thrown upon this fact by the statistics for *quod* in $\mathfrak{L}^{b}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$ which are:

	Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.
$\mathfrak{L}^{b}$	24	7	27	11
$\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$	22	4	35	18

It must be mentioned that $\mathfrak{L}^{b}$ is mutilated towards the end, where several examples occur in $\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$. The striking point here is that the figures show no agreement with $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ except in Mk. where both $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$ have 18 examples. It is still more extraordinary to find that in nearly all cases *quod* is found in $\mathfrak{L}^{b}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$, or in one of them, as well as in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

(*e*) Another interesting test is furnished by the rendering of the Greek aor. part. in the nom., which gave trouble to translators owing to the lack of a past part. act. in Latin. The chief methods adopted were to use the pres. part., *cum* with the subj., or the abl. abs. Thus *ἀκούσας* is rendered by *audiens*, *cum audisset*, *hoc audito* (or *audito* without *hoc*). It must be premised that the pres. part. is the normal form. It is highly exceptional for *cum* to predominate. The abl. abs. is comparatively rare, especially in ignorant translations.

The statistics for $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ are:

	Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.	Acts
pres. part.	249	32	261	100	58
cum	8	8	6	20	115
abl. abs.	6	1	3	23	29

In Evv. the pres. part. predominates; in Acts, however, there is a great preponderance of the *cum* type. The chief parallels to this which I have observed are in $\mathfrak{L}^{k}$, which in Mt. has 35 examples of *cum* to 21 of the pres. part., and in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, which in Lk. has 72 to 51. It will be observed that in Mk. there are more cases of *cum* and the abl. abs. than elsewhere in Evv. A comparison of the passages in question with $\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{b}$ is highly instructive. In 8 cases where $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ has *cum* it agrees with $\mathfrak{L}^{bff}$, in 9 others (in 5 of which $\mathfrak{L}^{b}$ is mutilated) with $\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$, in 2 with $\mathfrak{L}^{b}$ against $\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$. There remains one case of difference (xii. 34 *cum vidisset* $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$: *videns* $\mathfrak{L}^{bff}$). The instances of the abl. abs. show the same agreement with $\mathfrak{L}^{bff}$. In 13 cases $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ agrees with $\mathfrak{L}^{bff}$, in 10 others (in 3 of which $\mathfrak{L}^{b}$ is mutilated) with $\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$.

I add the figures for *cum* and abl. abs. in $\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$:

	Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.
cum	17	25	27	19
abl. abs.	27	5	29	27

It will be observed that the similarity to $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ is confined to Mk.

(*f*) O.-L. MSS. vary considerably in their use of *ait*. The register for $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ is somewhat singular, viz.:

Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.	Acts
15	2	0	70	13

The corresponding figures for $\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$ are:

Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.
60	20	71	63

The similarity is again confined to Mk. (in which $\mathfrak{L}^{b}$ has 66 exx.). It will be noticed that *ait* is fairly frequent in Acts. In view of various evidence which shows that the author of $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ in Acts had access to a MS. similar to $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, it is interesting to observe that $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has 44 exx.

(*g*) In many late writers the copulatives *-que*, *ac*, *atque* tend to become rare. Löfstedt points out that *-que* is found only twice in the vulgar portions of Petronius and is not used in the Pompeian inscriptions apart from two special cases (a formula and a quotation from Virgil), and is wholly wanting in Aetheria.[1] I have only observed 14 cases in the text of Irenaeus *contra Haereses*, together with three in quotations from the N.T. (none from O.T.). It is rare in the Epistle of Clement (3 exx.), and in the Latin Perpetua (2 exx., both in § 1). It does not occur in $\mathfrak{L}^{k}$ (Evv.) or $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ (Acts).

The figures for *-que* in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ are interesting:

Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.	Acts
0	0	0	4	56

The corresponding figures for $\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$ in Evv. are:

Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.
3	0	10	4

The 4 exx. of *-que* in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ are Mk. i. 35, vi. 22 *bis*, 25. $\mathfrak{L}^{bff}$ agree with $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ in i. 35 and vi. 25, while in vi. 22 (*bis*) *-que* is given by $\mathfrak{L}^{q}$ and *vg*.

There is not much to be said about *ac* and *atque* in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$. *Ac* occurs only once in Evv. (Mk. vi. 17) and three times in Acts (viii. 12, x. 23, xx. 31). *Atque* is not found in Evv., but occurs 3 times in Acts (vii. 29, 58, xviii. 26). In Mk. vi. 17 *ac* is also found in $\mathfrak{L}^{q}$ *vg*. In Acts $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has 21 exx. of *ac* and 2 of *atque*.

It will be convenient to take here the figures for *quoque*. Löfstedt (p. 137) notices that *quoque* is rare in Vegetius and Petronius and is not found in Filaster and Aetheria. It is not found in $\mathfrak{L}^{k}$ (Evv.), and is conspicuously rare in the other O.-L. MSS. of Evv. The figures for $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ are:

Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.	Acts
0	1	0	0	7

In 5 out of the 7 passages in Acts (ii. 40, 43, viii. 13, x. 24, xv. 32) it is used to translate δέ (not τε). This confusion is symptomatic of what has been called 'sickness' in a word.[2] In $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ there are 5 examples of *quoque*.

(*h*) The figures for *vero* (= δέ) in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ are striking, viz:

Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.	Acts
3	0	0	7	80

[1] Löfstedt, p. 87.

[2] Thielmann, *zu der Vulgata*, Philologus xlii. (1884) p. 366.

This is the most singular difference between the vocabulary of $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ in Evv. and in Acts. The corresponding figures for $\mathfrak{L}^{b,ff}$ in Evv. are:

	Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.
$\mathfrak{L}^{b}$	26	9	11	12
$\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$	24	4	16	28

The only similarity to $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ is in Mk.

There are 27 exx. of *vero* in $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$. In another MS. of Acts, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, which contains only chs. i–xiii. 6 and xxviii. 16–31, I have noticed 30 exx. The word does not occur in $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ (Acts): in $\mathfrak{L}^{k}$ (Evv.) I have noticed only one case (Mt. vi. 23) where it = δέ. It is used improperly in $\mathfrak{L}^{k}$ (Mk. xiv. 70) to render ἀληθῶς, just as *vere* is wrongly used to render δέ (Mk. viii. 28). Here again there are symptoms of 'sickness'.

(*i*) εὐθύς, εὐθέως.

The record for $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ is:

	Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.	Acts
confestim	0	3	4	7	0
continuo	12	0	2	5	2
mox	4	0	0	0	0
statim	0	0	0	19	2

The predominance of *continuo* in Mt. is to be noticed, also the use of *mox* (iii. 16, iv. 20, 22, xxi. 2), which does not occur in this sense elsewhere in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ or, so far as I am aware, in any other O.-L. MS. of Evv. It is also noticeable that *statim*, which is not used in Mt., Jn., or Lk., is the favourite rendering in Mk. The figures for $\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$ are (I omit *mox*):

	Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.
confestim	4	1	2	10
continuo	7	3	2	4
statim	3	2	2	9

(*j*) I have reserved until now a test which brings out a striking peculiarity of $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ in Mt.: viz. the rendering of ὁ δέ. The figures for $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ are:

	Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.	Acts
qui autem	59	0	0	0	1
qui	0	1	0	5	0
ille autem	1	0	6	0	0
ad (=at) ille	0	6	58	29	16

The single example of *qui autem* in Acts (xii. 5) comes after 2 exx. of *ad ille* and is probably used for the sake of variety. Otherwise *qui autem* is peculiar to Mt. It will be noticed that *qui* without *autem* is found five times in Mk., while it only occurs once elsewhere. In several other MSS. of Evv. *qui* is a frequent rendering. The record of $\mathfrak{L}^{b,ff}$ for *qui* is:

	Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.
$\mathfrak{L}^{b}$	2	1	12	4
$\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$	1	2	10	9

A comparison of these passages shows that $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ agrees in two of them with $\mathfrak{L}^{b,ff}$ (viii. 5, ix. 4) and with $\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$ in the other three which it contains (vi. 24, viii. 28, xiv. 20). This is somewhat surprising.

VI. Relation of $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ to $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

I treat first special agreements between $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$.

iv. 18 *συνκατατεθεμενων δε αυτων τη γνωμη*
consentientibus autem omnibus notitiam

The *στ.* is omitted by Γ. It occurs in $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.* with the v.l. *omnibus* for *αὐτῶν* as in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

vi. 14 *καταλυσει τον τοπον τουτον και αλλαξει τα εθη*
destruet locum istum et mutauit iterum

Iterum here is meaningless. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has *immutabit instar*, i.e. the 'code' of Moses. For *instar* in the sense of 'pattern' or 'example' we may compare Cypr., *Fort.* ch. xi. *passionis dominicae instar imitari.* I regard *iterum* as a corruption of *instar.*

In connexion with this may be mentioned xx. 9, where *D* has:

διαλεγομενου παυλου επι πλειον
disputante paulo prolixius

For *ἐπὶ πλεῖον* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ gives *perplexius* (diutius $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: diu *vg.*). It looks as if $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ here preserves a rendering which has been corrupted in $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ in the course of transmission.

vii. 2 *ωφθη τω πατρι ημων*
αβρααμ οντι εν τη μεσοποταμια
πριν η κατοικησαι αυτον

$\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ very absurdly renders *στ.* 3 by *postea quam mortuus esset.* This comes from *v.* 4 *μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ in the present passage combines two variants, viz.: *priusquam habitaret in carran priusquam mortuus est pater eius.*[1] $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ has adopted the second of these (with *postea quam* for *prius quam*).

xiv. 13 *οι δε ιερεις του οντος διος προ πολεως*
sacerdotes autem qui erant iouis ante ciuitatem

$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has exactly the same rendering, which implies a variant *οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς οἱ ὄντες τοῦ Διός.* This is peculiar to $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$.

ib. 21 *ευαγγελιζομενοι δε τους εν τη πολει*
και μαθητευσαντες πολλους
euangelizantes autem in illa ciuitate
et discipulos fecissent plures

$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has two *cum*-clauses (*cum . . . praedicassent et docuissent*). This has led to the mixed construction in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

[1] $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ omits *μετά . . . αὐτοῦ* in *v.* 4.

xv. 2 ελεγεν γαρ ο παυλος μενειν ουτως
καθως επιστευσαν διϊσχυριζομενος
dicebat autem paulus manere sic
sicut crediderunt

The passage is omitted by Γ, *cett.*, but found in *c.Th.* and $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$. The omission of *διϊσχυριζόμενος* is peculiar to $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$. This is a very clear case.

xvii. 11 ουτοι δε ησαν ευγενεις των εν τη θεσσαλονικη
hi autem sunt nobiliores qui thessalonicae sunt

The *proprius error*, *sunt* for ἦσαν, occurs also in $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$.

xviii. 21 δει δε παντως την εορτην ημεραν ερχομενην
ποιησαι εις ιεροσολυμα
oportet me sollemnem diem aduenientem
facere hierosolymis

The passage is omitted by Γ, *cett.*, but occurs in δ, 𝔖 and $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$. The omission of *πάντως* is peculiar to $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$ (and *vg.*^{aqw}).

xix. 21 και πορευεσθαι εις ιεροσολυμα
et sic ire in hierosolyma

$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ also has *sic* before *ire*. There is no other authority for the addition.

ib. 35 διοπετοῦς] Iouis $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, a *proprius error*.

xx. 9 τριστέγου] tristego $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$.
This Greek form is very rare (*Gen.* vi. 16, *Ezek.* xlii. 6 in O.T.).

xx. 18 ομως εοντων αυτων ειπεν προς αυτους
simulque cum esset ait ad eos

Most MSS. omit *ὅμως* (*ὁμοῦ A*) *ὄντων αὐτῶν*. The addition of *-que* is peculiar to $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$ (*et simul essent vg.*)

xxi. 21 κατηκησαν δε περι σου
diffamauerunt autem de te

κατήκησαν is a corruption for *κατηχήθησαν*. The mistranslation *diffamauerunt* is peculiar to $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$.

ib. 37 μελλων τε εισαγεσθαι
et cum iam induceretur

This use of *cum iam* to translate *μέλλων* is not found elsewhere in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ and I have not noted its occurrence in other old-Latin MSS. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has it here (*incipiensque induci* $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: *et cum coepisset induci vg.*).

I take separately xvii. 29:

η ενθυμησεως ανθρωπου
et cupiditatis humanae

There appears to have been a reading *ἐπιθυμίας* here, which $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ renders by *desiderii*, while Irenaeus has *concupiscentiae*. $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ may have taken the sense from a MS. similar to $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, although he did not use the same word.

There are some interesting passages in which alternative renderings are combined by $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

xi. 29 οι δε μαθηται καθως ευπορουντο ωρισαν
disciPuli autem sicut prout copiam

$\mathfrak{L}^d$ conflates *sicut* and *prout*, omitting ὥρισαν (probably also *habebant* after *copiam*). $\mathfrak{L}^g$ here has *prout*, so also $\mathfrak{L}^e$ and *vg.*, which are connected with it. The normal rendering of καθώς is *sicut*, of which I find 57 examples in $\mathfrak{L}^d$ (Evv. 49, Acts 8) as against one of *prout*, Mk. iv. 33, where it also occurs in several old-Latin MSS. It seems probable that *prout* in the present passage was taken over from a MS. similar to $\mathfrak{L}^g$.

xvii. 24 ουτος ουρανου και γης κ̅ς̅ υπαρχων
hic cum sit caeli et terrae dn̄s qui est

Cum sit and *qui est* are doublets. $\mathfrak{L}^g$ has *cum sit* after *hic*; so $\mathfrak{L}^e$ and *vg.* before or after κύριος. *Qui est* is peculiar to $\mathfrak{L}^d$.

xxi. 39 δαιομε (= δέομαι) δε σου συγχωρησαι μοι
cuius rogo obsegro autem mihi

Rogo and *obsecro* are alternatives. $\mathfrak{L}^g$ has *rogo*, which is the usual rendering. In iv. 31, the only other passage in Acts for which we have the evidence of $\mathfrak{L}^d$, δέομαι is rendered *obsecro*.

I take separately vii. 5:

και ουκ εδωκεν αυτω κληρονομιαν εν αυτη
et non dedit ei possessionem hereditatis in ea

$\mathfrak{L}^g$ renders κληρον. by *hereditatem*, while $\mathfrak{L}^e$, *vg.* give *possessionem*. It looks as if $\mathfrak{L}^d$ had conflated variants.

If we compare the quotations of Lucifer with $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, it is highly instructive to find that in a number of cases he agrees with $\mathfrak{L}^d$ against $\mathfrak{L}^g$. The most decisive of these are:

xiii. 6 Βαριησουα‖ *D*: Bariesuam $\mathfrak{L}^d$: Bariesubam *Luc.*: Βαριησοῦ *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^g$).
ib. 8 Ετοιμας *D*: Etoemas $\mathfrak{L}^d$: Etoemus *Luc.*: Elimas (Ἐλύμας *cett.*) $\mathfrak{L}^g$.

It is obvious that $\mathfrak{L}^g$ has here been brought into agreement with Γ, *cett.* in the course of transmission.

Other agreements of *Luc.* with $\mathfrak{L}^d$ against $\mathfrak{L}^g$ are:

ii. 38 τοῦ κυρίου] domini $\mathfrak{L}^d$: domini nostri *Luc.*: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^g$
ib. 40 παρεκάλει] + Petrus $\mathfrak{L}^g$ *sol.*
iii. 6 σοι δίδωμι] tibi do $\mathfrak{L}^d$, *Luc.*: do tibi $\mathfrak{L}^g$
iv. 16 πᾶσιν] + hominibus $\mathfrak{L}^g$ *sol.*
v. 6 ἀναστάντες] cum surrexissent $\mathfrak{L}^d$: surgentes *Luc.*: uenientes $\mathfrak{L}^g$
ib. 8 τοσούτου] tanti *Luc.*: tantum $\mathfrak{L}^d$: itaque $\mathfrak{L}^g$
ib. 15 ἀπηλλάσσοντο] liberabantur $\mathfrak{L}^d$, *Luc.*: liberantur $\mathfrak{L}^g$
ib. 21 τῶν υἱῶν] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^g$ *sol.*
ib. 40 δείραντες] caesis eis $\mathfrak{L}^d$: caesos eos *Luc.*: caesos $\mathfrak{L}^g$
ib. 41 ὀνόματος] + Iesu $\mathfrak{L}^g$ *sol.*
vii. 51 καὶ ὑμεῖς] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^g$ *sol.*
xii. 3 ὅτι ἀρεστόν ἐστιν] quod placeret hoc $\mathfrak{L}^d$, *Luc.*: quod placeret $\mathfrak{L}^g$
ib. 11 ὅτι ἀληθῶς] quia uere $\mathfrak{L}^d$, *Luc.*: uere quia (ἀληθῶς ὅτι cett.) $\mathfrak{L}^g$

ib. 18 τί ἄρα ὁ Πέτρος ἐγένετο] quid Petrus factus esset $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, *Luc.*: quid de Petro factum esset $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

xiii. 2 τῷ κυρίῳ] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *sol.*

ib. 10 καὶ ἀτενίσας] et intuitus $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$: et intendens *Luc.*: intendens $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

xvi. 24 τὴν ἐσωτέραν φυλακήν] imam carceris $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, *Luc.*: ima carceris $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

xx. 19 τῷ κυρίῳ μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης] domino cum (in *Luc.*) omni humilitate $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, *Luc.*: in omni hum. domino $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

ib. 20 διδάξαι] + eos $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *sol.*

ib. 31 γρηγορεῖτε . . . ἡμέραν] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *sol.*

It seems clear that the text used by Lucifer was closely connected with that employed in the construction of $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

In view of this evidence I venture to classify the variants of $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ on the supposition that they were mainly drawn from a Latin MS. of the $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ type.

(1) Simple agreements of $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ with $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *cett.*

i. 4 φησίν *D*, *vg.*, *Aug.*: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 17 ὅς *D*, *Aug.*[b]: καί $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 25 ἀναλαβεῖν *D*, *Aug.*[b]: ἕνα λαβεῖν $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* ii. 1 τοῦ *D*: καὶ ἐν τῷ $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* ib. ὄντων αὐτῶν πάντων *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ἦσαν πάντες ὁμοῦ $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 2 ἰδού *D*: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 3 ἐκάθισαν *D* ℵ, *alii*: ἐκάθισεν $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 6 καί *D*: ὅτι $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 9 οἱ *D*: καὶ οἱ $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 14 τότε σταθείς (+δέ) *D*: σταθεὶς δέ $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 15 οὔσης ὥρας τῆς ἡμέρας τρίτης *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{pt}$, *Aug.*: ἔστιν γὰρ ὥρα τρίτη τῆς ἡμέρας $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 17 πάσας σάρκας *D*: πᾶσαν σάρκα $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 22 ὅσα *D*: οἷς $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* iii. 16 ὅτι *D*: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 19 ἐπέλθωσιν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: ἔλθωσιν $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* iv. 14 ποιῆσαι ἤ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 15 ἀπαχθῆναι *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}$: ἀπελθεῖν $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 16 φανερώτερον *D*: φανερόν $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 17 οὖν *D*: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 22 ἦν *post* γάρ *et post* μ̄. *hab.* *D*: *post* γάρ $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 32 οὐδείς *D*: οὐδὲ εἷς τι $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* v. 8 ἐπερωτήσω σε *D*: εἰπέ μοι $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* ib. τὸ χωρίον τοσούτου *D*: τοσ. τὸ χωρίον $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 10 συστείλαντες *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 28 οὐ *D*, *alii*: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, Γ 34 ἐκ τοῦ συνεδρίου *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$: ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 36 ᾧ καί *D*: ᾧ $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* ib. διελύθη *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: ἀνῃρέθη $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* ib. αὐτὸς δι' αὐτοῦ *D*: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* vi. 6 οἵτινες *D*: καί $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* vii. 2 ἄρα *DE* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* ib. τοῦτο *D*: ταῦτα $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 3 καὶ τῆς *DB*: καὶ ἐκ τῆς $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 10 χάριν αὐτῷ *D*: αὐτῷ χάριν $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 22 πᾶσαν τὴν σοφίαν *D*, *Clem.*: ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 23 τεσσ. αὐτῷ *D*: αὐτῷ τεσσ. $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 44 ἑώρακεν *DE*: ἑωράκει $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 50 πάντα ταῦτα *DACE*: ταῦτα πάντα $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 54 καὶ ἔβρυχόν τε *D*: καὶ ἔβρυχον $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* viii. 2 συγκομίσαντες *D*: συνεκόμισαν δέ (τε) $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 6 ὡς δὲ ἤκουον *D*: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 9 προυπάρχων *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, *Iren.*: προυπῆρχεν $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* x. 14 ἤ *DCE* δ: καί $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 20 ἀνάστα *D*, *Aug.*: ἀναστάς $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 22 τις *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 28 ἀνδρὶ ἀλλοφύλῳ *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: ἀλλοφύλῳ $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 33 ἰδού *D*, *cf.* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: οὖν $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 36 γάρ *DC*, *alii*: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* ib. ὅν *D* ℵ, *alii*: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 38 καταδυναστευθέντας *D*, $\mathfrak{S}$, *Iren.*: καταδυναστευομένους $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* xi. 9 ἐγένετο *D*: ἀπεκρίθη $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* xii. 16 καὶ ἰδόντες *D*: εἶδον $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 19 ἀποκτανθῆναι *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ἀπαχθῆναι $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* xiii. 4 καταβάντες *D*: κατῆλθον $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* ib. ἐκεῖθεν *D*: ἐκεῖθέν τε (δέ) $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 46 ἐπειδή *DAB*: + δέ $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* xiv. 1 αὐτόν *D*: αὐτούς $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* xv. 17 ποιήσει *D*: ποιῶν $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 39 τότε *D*: τόν τε (δέ) $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* xvi. 9 ἐν ὁράματι *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ὅραμα $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 15 θεῷ *D*:

κυρίῳ $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 16 κυρίοις *D* : + αὐτῆς $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 21 ἡμᾶς *D* : ἡμῖν $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 24 ὁ δέ *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ὅς $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 34 σὺν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ *D* : πανοικί *cett.* : cum toto (omni) domu(-o) sua $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$ xvii. 5 ἐξαγαγεῖν *D*, $\mathfrak{E}$: προσαγαγεῖν $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 11 ἔχει *DE* : ἔχοι $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 12 τινες *D* : πολλοί $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 21 εἰς αὐτούς *D* : ἐκεῖ $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 23 διϊστορῶν *D* : ἀναθεωρῶν $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 26 προτεταγμένους *D* : προστ. $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* ib. κατὰ ὁροθεσίαν *D*, *Iren.* : καὶ τὰς ὁροθεσίας $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 27 μάλιστα *D* : *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 29 ἤ *D*, *Iren.* : καί $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* xviii. 2 προσῆλθεν *D* : + αὐτοῖς $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 5 παρεγένοντο δέ *D* : τότε ἐπῆλθον $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: ὡς δὲ κατῆλθον $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* ib. τότε *D*, *cf.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: ὅ τε $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 11 αὐτούς *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ἐν αὐτοῖς $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 16 ἀπέλυσεν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: ἀπήλασεν $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 21 ἀνακάμψω *D*, $\mathfrak{E}$: πάλιν ἀνακάμψω $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 25 ὅς *D* : οὗτος $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* xix. 9 τινὲς μὲν οὖν *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ὡς δέ τινες $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 10 ἕως . . . ἤκουσαν *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ὥστε . . . ἀκοῦσαι $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 22 ὀλίγον *D* : *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 26 οὗτοι *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 30 ἐκώλυον *D* : οὐκ εἴων $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 32 ἡ γὰρ ἐκκλησία ἦν *D* : ἦν γὰρ ἡ ἐκκλ. $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* ib. πλεῖστοι *D* : πλείους $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 35 κατασείσας *DE* 614 : καταστείλας $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 40 τῆς συστροφῆς *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: περὶ τῆς συστ. $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* xx. 2 χρησάμενος *D* : παρακαλέσας $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 5 αὐτόν *D* : ἡμᾶς $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 7 μιᾷ πρώτῃ *D* : μιᾷ $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 13 ὡς *D* : *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 21 διά . . . Ἰησοῦ *D* : εἰς . . . Ἰησοῦν $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* xxi. 15 τινὰς ἡμέρας *D* : τὰς ἡμ. ταύτας $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* ib. ἀποταξάμενοι *D* : ἐπισκευασάμενοι $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 24 ἀλλ' ὅτι *D*, $\mathfrak{E}$: ἀλλά $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 26 ὅπως *D* : ἕως οὗ $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 27 οἱ δέ *D* : οἱ $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 34 ἄλλα *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: ἄλλο τι *cett.* : ἄλλο $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$

In the above list I have confined myself to substitutions of a variant occurring in Γ, *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) in place of that found in *D*. There are a number of other cases where the readings of the two strains are conflated by $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

(2) I take first some simple illustrations:

v. 4 ποιησαι πονηρον τουτο
facere dolose rem istam

Γ, *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) give τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτο (*rem istam* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) without ποιῆσαι πονηρόν. $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ conflates.

x. 23 τοτε εισαγαγων ο πετρος εξενισεν αυτους
tunc ergo ingressus petrus hospitio excepit eos

Γ, *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) give εἰσκαλεσάμενος οὖν αὐτοὺς ἐξένισεν. $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ combines οὖν with τότε.

xi. 28 εφη εις εξ αυτων ονοματι αγαβος
σημενων δια του πνς
ait unus ex ipsis nomine agabus
significabat per spm̄

Γ, *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) give ἀναστὰς δὲ εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν ὀνόματι Ἄγαβος ἐσήμανεν (-αινεν) διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ has taken *significabat* from this source, while keeping ἔφη with *D*.

xiii. 30–1 ον ο θεος ηγειρεν ουτος ωφθη
quem ds̄ uero excitauit hic qui uisus est

Γ, *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) have ὅς for οὗτος. $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ conflates.

xvi. 18 ινα εξελθης απ αυτης και ευθεως εξηλθεν
ut exeas ab eam et eadem hora exiit

Γ, *cett.* (𝔏[g]) have ἐξελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῆς καὶ ἐξῆλθεν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ. 𝔏[d] adopts *eadem hora* for εὐθέως, but retains the collocation of *D*.

xvii. 14 τον μεν ουν παυλον
οι αδελφοι εξαπεστειλαν
statimquae paulum
fratres dismiserunt

Γ, *cett.* (𝔏[g]) have εὐθέως δὲ τότε τὸν Παῦλον ἐξαπέστειλαν οἱ ἀδελφοί. 𝔏[d] adopts εὐθέως δέ (τε), but retains the collocation found in *D*.

ib. 19 μετα δε ημερας τινας επιλαβομενοι αυτου
ηγαγον αυτον επι αρειον παγον
post dies aliquos adpraehensumque eum
adduxerunt ad arium pagum

Γ, *cett.* (𝔏[g]) have ἐπιλαβόμενοί τε αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἄρειον πάγον ἤγαγον (omitting μετά . . . τινάς). 𝔏[d] conflates the variants.

xx. 12 ασπαζομενων δε αυτων
ηγαγεν τον νεανισκον ζωντα
salutantes aute os (= eos)
adduxerunt iubenem uiuentem

Γ, *cett.* (𝔏[g]) omit στ. 1 and give ἤγαγον δὲ τὸν παῖδα ζῶντα. 𝔏[d] adopts ἤγαγον from this source, otherwise rendering *D*.

Further examples are :

vi. 3 τι ουν εστιν αδελφοι
επισκεψασθε εξ υμων αυτων
quid ergo est fratres
prospicite itaque ex uobis

Γ, *cett.* (𝔏[g]) give ἐπισκέψασθε δέ, ἀδελφοί, ἄνδρας ἐξ ὑμῶν. 𝔏[d] has inserted *itaque* (= δέ) from this source, otherwise following *D*.

viii. 6 ως δε ηκουον παν[τες] οι οχλοι
προσειχον
intendebant autem omnis turbae

Γ, *cett.* (𝔏[g]) give προσεῖχον δὲ (τε) οἱ ὄχλοι, omitting ὡς . . . πάντες. 𝔏[d] adopts this reading, except that it retains πάντες.

xiv. 19 διατριβοντων αυτων και διδασκοντων
επηλθον τινες ιουδαιοι
απο ικονιου και αντιοχιας
moras facientes eos et docentes
superuenerunt autem iudaei
ab iconio et antiochia

Here ℵ*AB*, *plerique* (𝔏[g]) omit στ. 1 and give ἐπῆλθον δὲ ἀπὸ Ἀντιοχείας καὶ Ἰκονίου Ἰουδαῖοι. 𝔏[d] adopts δέ and omits τινές in στ. 2, but otherwise agrees with *D*.

xv. 11–12 συνκατατεθεμενων δε των πρεσβυτερω̄
τοις υπο του πετρου ειρημενοις
εσειγησεν παν το πληθος
desponentes autem presbyteros
quae a petro dicebantur
sileuitque omnis multitudo

Γ, *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) omit στ. 1 and 2 and insert δέ after ἐσίγ. in στ. 3. $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ adopts *que* (τε) from this source.

ib. 38 παυλος δε ουκ εβουλετο λεγων
τον αποστησαντα απ αυτων απο παμφυλιας
και μη συνελθοντα εις το εργον
εις ο επεμφθησαν
τουτον μη ειναι συν αυτοις
paulus autem nolebat dicens hiis
qui discesserunt ab eis a pamphylia
et nec simul uenerunt ad opus
in quo missi erant
hunc non adsumerent secum

Γ, *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) give Π. δὲ ἠξίου τὸν ἀποστάντα ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Παμφ. καὶ μὴ συνελθόντα αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἔργον μὴ συμπαραλαμβάνειν τοῦτον (omitting στ. 4). $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ accepts συμπαραλ. in στ. 5, but otherwise, apart from blunders, follows *D*.

xx. 4 μελλοντος ουν εξειεναι αυτου μεχρι της ασιας
uolente autem comitari eum usquae ad asiā

Γ, *cett.* give συνείπετο δὲ αὐτῷ (+ἄχρι τῆς Ἀσίας *AE* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$). $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ adopts the missing verb (*D* is defective) and botches to obtain a construction.

ib. 26 αχρι ουν της σημερον ημερας καθαρος ειμι
propter quod hodierno die mundus sum

Γ, *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) give διότι μαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ ὅτι καθ. εἰμι. $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ adopts διότι from this source, but otherwise follows *D*.

xxi. 13 ειπεν δε προς ημας ο παυλος
respondit autem ad nos paulus

Respondit in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ is due to the fact that Γ, *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) either substitute ἀπεκρίθη or εἶπεν, or combine the two verbs.

(3) I have reserved until now three passages in which $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ has a somewhat complicated corruption.

xvi. 19 ως δε ειδαν οι κυριοι της πεδισκης
οτι απεστερησθαι της εργασιας αυτων
ης ειχαν δι αυτης
cum uidissent domini eius puelles
quoniam ispes et reditus eorum
quem habebant per ipsam

Γ, *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) give ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ κύριοι αὐτῆς ὅτι ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς ἐργασίας αὐτῶν (omitting στ. 3).

$\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ introduces ἡ ἐλπίς, but excludes both ἀπεστερησθαι (-ηνται *Blass*) and ἐξῆλθεν, thus producing nonsense.

xvii. 5 *οι δε απειθουντες ιουδαιοι*
συνστρεψαντες τινας ανδρας
των αγοραιων πονηρους
adsuptis uero iudaeis
conuertentes quosdam uiros
forenses subdoles

This is a very complicated passage. The Γ reading is *ζηλώσαντες δὲ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ προσλαβόμενοι τῶν ἀγοραίων ἄνδρας τινάς*. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has *Iudaei autem assumptis forensibus quibusdam uiris nequissimis*, omitting ζηλώσαντες δέ (οἱ δὲ ἀπειθοῦντες) altogether. $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ is founded upon $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, the result being nonsense.

xxi. 39 *εγω ανθρωπος μεν ειμι ιουδαιος*
εν ταρσω δε της κιλικιας γεγεννημενος
δαιομε (= δεομαι) δε σου συνχωρησαι μοι
ego homo quidem sum iudaeus
n
tarsesis ex ciliciae non ignotae ciuitatis
cuius rogo obsegro autem mihi

D has here omitted the words οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως πολίτης which in Γ, *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) come in after Κιλικίας. $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ has brought them back into the text, excluding γεγεννημένος in στ. 2 and placing *cuius* (= *ciuis*) in στ. 3. The doublet *rogo* for the rarer word *obsecro* in στ. 3 has already been mentioned. Its introduction caused the disappearance of an equivalent for συγχωρῆσαι (ἐπίτρεψον Γ). The result is mere nonsense.

The instances so far given have been of readings in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ common to Γ and $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$. It is not asserted that they were all taken from $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, but that they may have been. There are other cases in which $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, in its present form at any rate, was not the source. Thus in one of the cases given in list (2) above, xiii. 30, where $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ conflates οὗτος *D* and ὅς Γ, *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$), $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ also inserts *uero* (= δέ) after $\overline{ds}$, with Γ, *cett.*, except $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, which omits the word.

Other examples are:

iv. 21 *μη ευρισκοντες αιτιαν το πως κολασωνται αυτους*
nihil inuenientes causam qua punirent eos

The reading of Γ is μηδὲν εὑρ. without αἰτίαν. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ omits αἰτίαν, but has *non* (= μή), so also *Luc.* $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ combines *nihil* (= μηδέν) with αἰτίαν.

xi. 26 *και τοτε πρωτον εχρηματισεν (= -αν) εν αντιοχεια*
οι μαθηται χρειστιανοι
et tunc primum nuncupati sunt in antiochiā
discipulos christianos

The accusatives in στ. 2 are due to the reading of Γ χρηματίσαι τε πρώτως ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τοὺς μαθητὰς Χριστιανούς. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, however, has *et tunc primum nuncupati sunt Antiochia discentes Christiani* with *D*.

xviii. 15 ει δε ζητημα εχετε περι λογου και ονοματω̄
si autem quaestio est de uerbo et nominibus

The Γ reading is εἰ δὲ ζητήματά ἐστι περὶ λ. κ. ὀν. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has *quod si quaestiones habetis de uerbo et de nominibus*, i. e. it takes ζητήματα from Γ and keeps ἔχετε with *D*. $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, on the other hand, keeps ζήτημα with *D* and adopts ἐστι from Γ.

xix. 29 και συνεχυθη ολη η πολις αισχυνης
et repleta est tota ciuitas confusionem (= -e)

Here $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ = Γ, *cett.*, which give καὶ ἐπλήσθη ἡ πόλις (+ ὅλη *E* δ) τῆς συγχύσεως. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has *et confusa est uniuersa ciuitas* = καὶ συνεχύθη ὅλη ἡ πόλις, i.e. it = *D*, except that αἰσχύνης has been added in *D* from $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

xx. 16 μηποτε γενηθη αυτω κατασχεσις τις εν τη ασια
ut non contingeret ei morandi quis in asia

The Γ reading is ὅπως μὴ γένηται αὐτῷ χρονοτριβῆσαι ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ. $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ combines χρονοτριβῆσαι with τις, a singular performance. This cannot be due to $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, which has *ne qua mora illi fieret in Asia*, a rendering which appears to agree with *D*.

I add some minor cases of difference between $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$.

iii. 18 ὅ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: ὅς $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ἅ *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) iv. 16 ποιήσομεν *D* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ποιήσωμεν Γ *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ 29 πάσης παρρησίας *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.*: παρρ. πάσης Γ, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ v. 16 καί *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.*: οἵτινες *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) 27 ἱερεύς *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.*: ἀρχιερεύς *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) 28 ἐκείνου *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, *Luc.*: τούτου *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) vi. 1 ταύταις ταῖς ἡμέραις *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ταῖς ἡμ. ταύταις *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) 11 βλασφημίας *D* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: βλάσφημα *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) xi. 7 ἀνάστα *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ἀναστάς Γ, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ xii. 7 αὐτοῦ *post* χειρῶν *hab. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.*, *post* ἐξέπεσον *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) xiii. 5 κυρίου *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.*: θεοῦ *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) 12 ἰδὼν δέ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: τότε ἰδών *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) 47 ὁ κύριος *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ἡμῖν ὁ κύρ. *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) xv. 26 ἀπαγγελοῦντας *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ἀπαγγέλλοντας *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) xvi. 28 φωνῇ μεγάλῃ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *plerique*: μεγάλῃ φωνῇ *AB*, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ xix. 17 φόβος ἔπεσεν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ἐπέπεσεν (ἔπεσεν) φόβος *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) xx. 24 μου *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *om.* Γ, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ 27 τοῦ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: τοῦ μή *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) xxi. 19 οὕς *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: καί . . . αὐτούς *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$)

In six of these exceptional cases (iv. 29, v. 16, 27, 28, xii. 7, xiii. 5) $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ is supported by *Luc.*, while $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ has a Γ variant.

There is not much left in the variants of $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ which requires mention. For the sake of completeness, however, I add a few remarks.

In the previous lists I restricted myself to those readings which are common to Γ. These form the great majority, but there are a few in which the authorities are divided. I add these here.

iii. 26 ὑμῶν] αὐτῶν *C*, $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *Iren.* vi. 3 δέ] οὖν *CE* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, 𝔖 vii. 3 καὶ τῆς *DB*: καὶ ἐκ τῆς $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.*, *Iren.* 35 σὺν χειρί] ἐν χειρί א 383, $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$ 36 ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$): ἐν τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ *BC*, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ 60 ταύτην τὴν ἁμαρτίαν] τὴν ἁμαρτ. ταύτην א *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ xiii. 18 ἐτροποφόρησεν] ἐτροφοφόρησεν *AC*, $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, 𝔖, 𝔈 46 ἐπειδή *DAB*: ἐπειδὴ δέ $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *cett.* 48 θεοῦ] κυρίου א *AC*, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ xiv. 7 εὐαγγελιζόμενοι ἦσαν] ἦσαν εὐαγγ. *CE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ (predicabant euangelium $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) xvi 29 ὑπάρχων *DC*: γενόμενος א *AB*, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$: *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.*

It will be noticed that in all these cases, except vii. 36, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ agrees with $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ (xiv. 7 proves nothing).

I take separately xix. 39:

εἰ δε τι περι ετερων επιζητειτε
si quid autem ulterius requiritis

The variant περαιτέρω (*ulterius*) is peculiar to *B* and $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$. As $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ is not elsewhere corrected from *B*, while $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ is (cf. xxvii. 27 προσαχεῖν *B*: resonare $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$), there is strong reason to suppose that $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ is here indebted to $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ for this rare reading.

The following variants find no support in Γ:—i. 15 ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{dgp}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Aug.* iv. 18 παρήγγειλαν] + αὐτοῖς δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, $\mathfrak{C}$, *Luc.* vii. 11 τῆς Αἰγύπτου *D*: τὴν Αἴγυπτον Γ: τὴν γῆν Αἰγύπτου *E* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, $\mathfrak{S}$ x. 16 πάλιν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$): *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{C}^{vg}$

In a few cases support is found from Latin sources, apart from $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, e.g. i. 20 αὐτοῦ] αὐτῶν $\mathfrak{L}^{dt}$ (not $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) ii. 29 ἐξόν] + μοι $\mathfrak{L}^{de}$, *vg.*[a]

Among sporadic agreements, which may be due to accident, may be noted:

ii. 17 ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου] spiritum meum $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, *reb.* (not $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) 30 οὖν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$): δέ $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, *Iren.* 32 πάντες ἡμεῖς] ἡμεῖς πάντες $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$. $\mathfrak{S}$, *Iren.* vi. 4 προσκαρτεροῦντες *D*: προσκαρτερήσομεν (erimus perseuerantes $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) *cett.*: perseueramus *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$

Apart from mistranslations and occasional Latinisms introduced into *D*,[1] the original contributions of $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ are practically *nil.*

I have noted the following variants peculiar to $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, generally differences of collocation:—

i. 11 οὕτως] sic enim, *cf.* vi. 2 ii. 33 βλέπετε καὶ ἀκούετε] uidistis et audistis iii. 15 οὗ] quibus iv. 24 ἦραν φωνήν] uocem leuauerunt ib. σὺ ὁ θεός] tu es deus 33 πάντας αὐτούς] eos omnes v. 29 δεῖ θεῷ] deo oportet vi. 2 οὐκ] non enim vii. 10 χάριν αὐτῷ] ei gratiam ib. ἡγούμενον *om.* 16 τοῦ Συχέμ] et sychem 20 ἀνετράφη μῆνας τρεῖς] mensibus tribus educatus est 21 ἀνεθρέψατο αὐτῇ εἰς υἱόν] uice fili educauit sibi 45 διαδεξάμενοι *om.* viii. 3 τὴν ἐκκλησίαν] ecclesias 9 ἑαυτόν *om.* x. 47 μήτι τὸ ὕδωρ κωλῦσαί τις δύναται] numquid aliquis aquam prohibere potest (*variant alii*) ib. μή *om.* xii. 1 τὰς χεῖρας] manus suas 17 τόπον *om.* xiii. 25 Ἰωάννης τὸν δρόμον] cursum Iohannes ib. με ὑπονοεῖτε] suspicamini me 28 κρίναντες] iudicantes autem 29 μέν *om.* 46 θεοῦ] domini 47 τοῖς ἔθνεσιν] super gentibus xvi. 1 καὶ ἰδού] ecce 14 τῆς πόλεως Θυατείρων] Thyatirum ciuitatis xviii. 2 τῷ γένει] nomine xix. 27 τοῦτο *om.* xx. 3 ἀναχθῆναι εἰς Συρίαν] in Syriam perduci xxi. 27 συντελουμένης δέ] + eis

These insignificant variants are all negligible.

The result of this analysis is to show that $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ is of little value. In basis it is a servile translation of *D* and adds nothing to its authority. Where it differs from *D*, it has been brought into conformity with Γ, *cett.* In all probability the

[1] The clearest case of a Latinism in *D* is xix. 29, mentioned above (p. 218), where αἰσχύνης (= *confusione*) has been added from $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$. Others are xiii. 28, where ἵνα is added before εἰς ἀναίρεσιν from *ut interficeretur* in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, also εἰσιν from *sunt*: xviii. 21 ἡμέραν after ἑορτήν from *sollemnem diem* in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$; possibly i. 20 μὴ ᾖ from *non sit* in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$. Others seem less certain.

great majority of such alterations are due to the use of a Latin MS. resembling 𝔏[g] and the version employed by Lucifer. They possess no value for the criticism of the text. It is only where *D* fails through either erasure or mutilation that 𝔏[d] becomes a first-rate authority, and then only if it contains readings which differ from those of Γ, *cett.* In such cases we may infer that the readings in question were those of *D*.

I take first the clearest case. In xviii. 17 Γ, *cett.* give καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων τῷ Γαλλίωνι ἔμελεν. The reading of *D* is illegible. (Scrivener's decipherment is misleading, as a glance at the facsimile will show. The whole στ. is erased.) 𝔏[d] has *tunc gallio fingebat eum non uidere* (= τότε ὁ Γαλλίων προσεποιεῖτο αὐτὸν μὴ ἰδεῖν), and a similar reading is given by 𝔏[h] and Ephrem. There can therefore be no doubt that this was originally found in *D*. Other cases are x. 46 *praeuaricatis* 𝔏[d] (*D eras.*) xiii. 6 *bariesuam* 𝔏[d]: βαριησουα|| *D* 8 *etoemas* 𝔏[d]: ετ||ιμας *D* 27 *non intellegentes* 𝔏[d] (*D eras.*) xviii. 7 *ab acyla* 𝔏[d] (*D eras.*) xx. 4 δουβ||ριος *D*: *douerius* 𝔏[d]. In the important passage xxi. 16–17, where *D* is no longer extant, though its readings are recorded, 𝔏[d] represents its tradition. Minor passages are x. 8 *uisum* (= τὸ ὅραμα), 10 *cecidit* (= ἐπέπεσεν), 11 *linteum splendidum* (= ὀθόνην λαμπράν), xxi. 5 *uiam nostram* (= τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν), xxii. 11 *ut autem surrexi* (= ὡς δὲ ἀνέστην).

(2) MICHIGAN PAPYRUS No. 1571 (*pap.*)

The emergence of this papyrus is an event of the highest importance, since it proves beyond doubt that a *Z* text of Acts similar to that found in *D* and *c.Th.* existed in Egypt, as well as elsewhere, at a very early date. The papyrus contains in a mutilated form chs. xviii. 27–xix. 6 and xix. 12–16. These few verses, by a fortunate accident, fall in a portion of Acts where there are a number of notable *Z* variants.

Professor H. A. Sanders of Michigan, who deciphered the papyrus,[1] says that it was bought in Cairo in 1924. It formed part of a large purchase which was subsequently distributed among various institutions by Mr. H. I. Bell of the British Museum. Many of the documents which fell to the share of Michigan came from the Fayûm. It is therefore not unlikely that the papyrus may have come from that district.

The date of *pap.* is naturally of great importance. Professor Sanders, on various grounds which can only be judged by papyrologists, assigns it to the period between A.D. 200 and 250. Professor A. S. Hunt is inclined to put it early in the fourth century. Professor Schubart, when asked for an opinion, replied:

> 'Die Schrift des Papyrus möchte ich nicht wie Sanders in die erste Hälfte des 3 Jahrhunderts setzen, sondern frühestens aus Ende des 3 Jahrh.; lieber Anfang des 4 Jahrh.'[2]

[1] *Harvard Theol. Review*, xx. 1 (1927).

[2] *Bulletin of Bezan Club*, v. p. 26.

Professor Wilcken, in answer to a similar question, expressed himself with great reserve and was unwilling to give an opinion on the subject.[1] It appears therefore that the authorities are not in agreement upon the exact dating of *pap.*, but it seems to be generally allowed that it is prior to the oldest uncials (א *B*).

As few readers are likely to possess Sanders's article, I think it well to reproduce here his transcript and supplements. At his request I have made two modifications, in lines 10 and 19 of the recto, where he now accepts the corrections of other scholars.

Recto

xviii. 27 [. . . . . .]θειν αχαϊα πολυ συνε[βαλλετο εν ταις εκκλη]
28 [σι]αι[ς] ευτονως γαρ τοις ιου[δαι]οις διακ[ατηλεγ]
[χετο] δημοσια δια[λεγομεν]ος επι[δεικνυς]
xix. 1 [δια τ]ων γραφων χ̅ρ̅ν̅ [ειναι] ι̅η̅ν̅ θελοντ[ος δε]
[του π]αυλου κατα τη[ν ιδιαν βου]λη[ν πορευ]
[εσθα]ι εις ιεροσολυμα [ειπεν αυτω] το [π̅ν̅α̅]
[υποστρ]εφειν εις τ[ην ασιαν διελθων δε τα]
2 [ανωτ]ερικα μερ[η ε]ρχετα[ι εις εφεσον] και [ει]
[πεν τοι]ς μαθηταις ει π̅ν̅α̅ αγ[ιον ελαβ]ετε πι
[στευσα]ντες οι δ απεκρειva[ντο προ]ς αυτō
[αλλ ου]δ ει π̅ν̅α̅ αγιον λαμβαν[ουσιν τι]νες η
3 [κουσα]μεν· ο δε παυλος προς αυ[του]ς· [ει]ς τι οῡ
[εβαπτ]ισθητε· οι δε ελεγον εις το [ι]ωαννου
4 [βαπτι]σμα ειπεν δε παυλος ϊωαννης εβ[α]
[πτισε]ν βαπτισμα μετανοιας τω λαω λεγω[ν]
[εις τον] ερχομενον με[τ] αυτον ινα πιστευ[σω]
5 [σιν του]τ εστιν εις τον ι̅η̅ν̅ ακου[σ]αντε[ς δε]
[τουτο εβαπτι]σθησαν εις το ονομα του κ̅[υ̅]
6 [ι̅η̅υ̅ του κ̅υ̅ ημων εις α]φεσιν αμαρτιων κ[αι]
[επιθεντος αυτοις το]υ πα[υλου χειρα] επε[πε]
[σεν π̅ν̅α̅ το αγιον επ αυ]του[ς . . . .]

Verso

xix. 12 επι τους ασθενουν[τας]
[επιφε]ρεσθα[ι α]πο του χρωτος σουδα[ρια]
η σιμικινθι[α κ]αι απαλλασσεσθαι α[π αυτω̄]
[τ]ας νοσου[ς τα τ]ε π̅ν̅τ̅α̅ τα πονηρα ε[κπο]
13 [ρευε]σθ[αι επεχειρ]ησαν δε τινες κ[αι εκ]
[των περιερχομενω]ν ϊουδαιων εξ[ορκι]
[στων ονομαζειν επ]ι τους εχοντ[ας τα]

[1] *ib.* p. 25.

πν̅[τα τα πον]ηρα τ̣[ο ο]νομα του κ̅[υ̅ ι̅η̅υ̅]
λ[εγοντες] ε̣ξορκιζομεν ὑμας το̣ν [ι̅η̅ν̅]
14 ο̣ν [κηρυ]σσει ο παυλος εν οις και υ[ιοι]
ϊο̣[υ]δαιου τινο̣ς αρχιερεως ηθ̣[ελη]
σα̣ν [το α]υτο ποιησαι εθος εχοντες [εξορκι]
ζειν τ̣ους τοιουτους και εισελθο[ντες]
προς δαιμονιζομενον ηρξα[ντο επι]
καλεισθαι το ονομα λεγοντες π̣[αραγγελ]
λομεν σοι εν ι̅η̅υ̅ ον παυλος ο [αποστο]
15 λος κη̣ρυσσει εξ̣ελθειν απο[κριθεν]
δε το π̅ν̅α̅ το πονηρο̣[ν ειπεν αυτοις ι̅η̅ν̅]
[γ]ει[νωσκω κα]ι το[ν παυλον επισταμαι]
16 [υ]μ̣[εις δε τινε]ς εσ̣[τε και εφαλομενος]
[ο ανθρωπος ε]π α̣[υτους . . . .]

In l. 10 of the recto Sanders originally read

[στευσα]ν̣τ̣ε̣ς̣ το ιδιο̅ [το]υ κυ̅ ειναι[ι οι δε προ]ς αυτο̅

but now accepts the correction made by Wilcken and confirmed by Schubart, in agreement with a quotation of Jerome.

In l. 19 κυ̅ ημων in the supplement was suggested by Professor Hunt in place of χριστου (*plene scriptum*).

For the στίχοι in *D*, I refer to the text in this edition. For the convenience of the reader I add here in White's Latin the quotations given by Thomas from the Enaton MS. viz.:

xix. 1 cum autem vellet Paulus cogitatione sua ire Hierosolymam, dixit ei spiritus, converte te in Asiam. Cum peragrasset autem partes superiores, venit in Ephesum.

2 (sed neque si) accipiant aliqui

14 in quibus *erant* filii septem Scevae cuiusdam sacerdotis, qui voluerunt id ipsum facere: qui soliti erant adiurare super eos qui tales *erant*. Et cum ingressi essent ad demoniacum coeperunt invocare nomen dicentes, praecipimus tibi per Iesum quem Paulus praedicat *ut* exeas. 15 Respondens autem spiritus ille malus dixit

In xix. 1 the agreement of *pap.* with *D* and *c.Th.* is exact, except that *c.Th.* has *converte te* (ὑποστρέφου) for ὑποστρέφειν (*D. pap.*). This, however, appears to be a Syriac idiom, not a variant. Γ, *cett.* here have an abbreviated reading. In *v.* 2 (λαμβάνουσίν τινες) no variation is possible.

In xix. 14–15 the case is more complicated. The passage occupies eight στίχοι in *D*, of which 1–2 (ἐν οἷς . . . ποιῆσαι) and 8 (τότε . . . αὐτοῖς) are found with variants in Γ, *cett.*, while 3–7 (ἔθος . . . ἐξελθεῖν) are peculiar to *D*, *pap.*, *c.Th.*: *om.* Γ, *cett.*

Sanders is of opinion that *pap.* is more closely connected with *c.Th.* than with *D*, and finds three cases of agreement between *pap.* and *c.Th.* against *D* in στ. 3–7. One of these is a question of collocation, viz. ἐξορκίζειν τοὺς τοιούτους *pap.*:

τοὺς τοιούτους ἐξορκ. *D*: *adiurare super eos qui tales*, *c.Th.* I look upon this as a fairly clear case. Another example is somewhat doubtful, viz. ἔθος ἔχοντες *pap.*: ἔθος εἶχαν *D*: *qui soliti erant c.Th.* Sanders thinks that the reading of *c.Th.* stands for ἔχοντες. It might, however, equally well imply οἳ ἔθος εἶχαν. The third case is a scribal error in *D*, viz. ἐξελθεῖν κηρύσσει for κηρύσσει ἐξελθεῖν. This is a mere accident which proves nothing. It is to be noticed that the correct order is preserved by 𝔏^{d} (*praedicat exire*). Sanders adds a fourth instance from στ. 8, but here, as in στ. 1–2, the situation is complicated by the entry of Γ into the problem. Where Γ exists, it is always possible that the two strains may have been mixed.

I now pass on to the second class of variants, i.e. those which occur in passages for which we have the evidence of Γ, as well as of *D* (*alii*).

(*a*) Agreements of *pap.* with *D* (*alii*) against Γ, *cett.*

xviii. 27 εἰς τὴν Ἀχαΐαν *D pap.*, 𝔖^{ph} : *om.* Γ, *cett.*

ib. πολὺ συνεβάλλετο *D pap.*, *Aug.*: συνεβ. πολύ Γ, *cett.*

ib. ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις *D pap.* (*suppl. Sanders in lac.*): *om.* Γ, *cett.*

ib. τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν διὰ τῆς χάριτος] *om. D pap.* The words come at the end of a στίχος in *D*.

xviii. 28 διαλεγόμενος καί (*om.* καί *pap.*) *D pap.* δ: *om.* Γ, *cett.*, *Aug.*

xix. 3 ἔλεγον *D pap.*: εἶπον Γ *E* δ

5 τοῦτο (ταῦτα) *D pap.* (*suppl. Sand. in lac.*), 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Hier.*: *om.* Γ, *cett.*

ib. εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν *D pap.* δ, 𝔖^{ph}: *om.* Γ, *cett.* (στ.)

6 ἐπέπεσεν *D pap.*, *Hier.*: ἦλθεν Γ, *cett.*

14 ἐν οἷς καί (*om.* καί *c.Th.*) *D c.Th. pap.*: ἦσαν δέ Γ, *cett.*

ib. ἠθέλησαν τὸ αὐτὸ ποιῆσαι *D c.Th. pap.*: τοῦτο ποιοῦντες Γ, *cett.*

The most important of these agreements is in xviii. 27, where *pap.* and *D* appear to omit a στίχος in a common ancestor.

(*b*) Agreements of *pap.* with Γ (*alii*) against *D*.

xix. 4 Χριστόν *D*: τὸν Ἰησοῦν (+Χριστόν 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈) *pap. cett.*

6 εὐθέως *D*: *om. pap. cett.*

14 ἱερέως *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{g}: ἀρχιερέως *pap. cett.* I regard ἱερέως here as indubitably right. If so, *pap.* has been interpolated from Γ, *cett.* For other variants here cf. *infra.*

To these may be added xix. 15, where, for τότε ἀπεκρίθη (*D*), *pap.* with Γ, *cett.* has ἀποκριθὲν δέ. The rest of the line is somewhat uncertain.

(*c*) Sporadic agreements with other authorities against *D* Γ, *cett.*

xix. 2 οἱ δὲ πρὸς αὐτόν *D* Γ: οἱ δὲ ἀπεκρείνα[ντο πρὸ]ς αὐτόν *pap.* (*cf. supra*): responderunt *Hier.*: responderunt et dixerunt ei 𝔖^{vg}.

xix. 13 ἐξορκίζομεν *pap.* δ (*cf. vg.*^{a}, 𝔖): ὁρκίζω *D* Γ, *cett.*

(*d*) Original contributions of *pap.*

xviii. 28 Χριστὸν εἶναι Ἰησοῦν *pap.*: τὸν Ἰησοῦν εἶναι Χριστόν *D*, 𝔖, *Aug.*: εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν Γ *E* δ.

xix. 2 κ̣α̣ι̣ [ειπεν τοι]ς μαθηταις *pap.* (*Sanders*): καὶ εὑρὼν τινας μαθητὰς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, 𝔈: καὶ εὑρεῖν τινας μαθ. εἶπέν τε πρὸς αὐτούς Γ.

3 ὁ δὲ Παῦλος πρὸς αὐτούς *pap.*: εἶπεν δέ (εἶπέν τε, ὁ δὲ εἶπεν) *D* Γ, *cett.* (+πρὸς αὐτούς 383, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Hier.*)

12 ἀπὸ τοῦ χρωτός *pap.*: + αὐτοῦ *D* Γ, *cett.*

13 ὃν κηρύσσει ὁ Παῦλος *pap.*: ὃν Παῦλος κηρύσσει *D* Γ, *cett.*

14 Παῦλος ὁ [ἀπόστο]λος κηρύσσει *pap.*: Παῦλος κηρύσσει *D* Γ, *cett.*

Apart from xviii. 28, where all the variants are equally possible, these readings do not produce a favourable impression. The abbreviated reading in xix. 2 is harsh, since it makes Paul address the disciples without first stating that he met disciples there. Probably *pap.* has been botched here after an omission. The omission of αὐτοῦ in xix. 12 may be a slip, while the additions of Παῦλος in xix. 3 and ὁ ἀπόστολος in *v.* 14 are distinctly suspicious.

I have not included in these lists certain passages where the reading of *pap.* is very doubtful. The chief case is in xix. 14, where, according to Sanders's transcript, *pap.* omits not only ἑπτά, which is omitted by *D*, but Σκευᾶ, which is found in all other authorities and is necessary to the sense. The ascription to *pap.* of Ἰουδαίου (= Γ, *cett.*: *om. D c.Th.*) seems very doubtful. Sanders gives ϊο[υ] δαιου, remarking that there is space in the lacuna after ϊο for two letters. He supposes that there was 'either a small place in the papyrus on which the scribe could not write, or else an error immediately crossed out, which took the space of two letters'. If the papyrus really had Ἰουδαίου here, I can only suppose that the word was an interpolation from Γ, *cett.*, which took the place of Σκευᾶ.

There are some minor cases where there is little to choose between one supplement and another. In xix. 6 Sanders prefers χεῖρα (*D*) to χεῖρας (Γ) because 'the addition of another letter would crowd the space', and in xix. 16 he prefers ἐφαλόμενος (Γ) to ἐναλλόμενος (*D*) and ἐφαλλόμενος (δ). It will be seen from the transcript that both these passages are badly mutilated. A similar remark applies to xix. 13, where for ἐκ τῶν (*D*) or καὶ τῶν (Γ) Sanders fills up a lacuna with καὶ ἐκ τῶν.

I have reserved until the end of this discussion some trivial variants in connexion with the use of the article, viz.:

xix. 4 ὁ Παῦλος *D*: Παῦλος *pap.* Γ *E* δ   5 κυρίου *D*: τοῦ κυρίου *pap.* Γ *E* δ
13 κυρίου *D*: τοῦ κυρίου *pap.* Γ *E* δ   xix. 14 τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον *D*: δαιμον. *pap.* (*def.* Γ *E* δ).

In two places (xix. 12 and 13) Sanders attributes to *D* the omission of τά before πονηρά. As a matter of fact, however, *D* has τά on both occasions, as may be seen from the facsimile of the MS. (also from Scrivener's transcript). I notice that Ropes omits τά in his transcript of *D* on both occasions and infer that Sanders has inherited this error from him.

I conclude with a few remarks[1] upon the gap between xix. 6 ἐπ' αὐτούς and 12 ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας. Sanders says that the lost portion between the two fragments belonged to the first page, and is of opinion that it occupied 16 lines of the papyrus.

The figures which are given by his transcript of the first page, excluding line 21, which is imperfect, are:

41, 38, 33, 33, 32, 32, 33, 34, 34, 38, 33, 34, 33, 31, 33, 34, 33, 32, 33, 34 = 678 letters, *avg.* 34 letters in a line (34 × 20 = 680). In line 1 I have taken the

[1] Reprinted, with a few corrections, from *J.T.S.* xxix (1927), pp. 27–8.

six dots at the beginning to represent letters, but the line is curiously long. Line 21 is imperfect, and requires 13 more letters to bring it up to the average length of 34 letters.

If Sanders is right in his supposition that 16 lines have perished, their contents should be $16 \times 34 = 544$ letters.

In these verses *D* does not differ greatly from Γ, the only extra passages being in *v.* 8 + ὁ Παῦλος with 𝔏^g, 𝔖^vg: *ib.* + ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλῃ with *c.Th.*: *v.* 9 + αὐτῶν with 𝔏^g, 𝔖^vg: *ib.* + τῶν ἐθνῶν τότε (*om.* τότε *E*) with *E*, 𝔖: *ib.* + ὁ Παῦλος with 𝔖^vg: *ib.* + τινος with most authorities (*om.* Γ, *Sah.*): *ib.* + ἀπὸ ὥρας ε̅ ἕως δεκάτης, with δ, 𝔏^g, *vg.*^aw, 𝔖^ph, *Ambst.*

D does not contain a famous variant found in *c.Th.* and some Latin authorities in *v.* 6, where it gives

ε]λαλουν δε γλωσσαις και επροφητευον

in conformity with Γ; nor does 𝔖^ph. In White's edition the reading of *c.Th.* is given as

'Et loquebantur linguis aliis et sentiebant in se ipsis quod et interpretarentur illas hi ipsi; quidam autem prophetabant'.

The extra matter here represents, after γλώσσαις:

ἑτέραις, καὶ ἐπεγίνωσκον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὥστε καὶ ἑρμηνεύειν αὐτὰς ἑαυτοῖς· τινὲς δὲ (= 66 lett.)

𝔏^p (*m.* 2) has above the line and in the wrong place, after ἐπροφ., *ita ut ipsi sibi interpretarentur* = ὥστε καὶ ἑρμ. αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς, and the same variant is found in several Vulgate MSS. which have incorporated readings from *Z*. Ephrem in Cat.^arm says 'they spoke with tongues, and interpreted of themselves'.

We have now to compare the number of letters in the various authorities with $16 \times 34 = 544$.

In Γ, allowing for abbreviations of *nomina sacra* (θ̅ς̅, κ̅ς̅), the total number of letters between αὐτούς in *v.* 6 and ἐπί in *v.* 12 is 448. From this, however, we must deduct 13 letters, required to complete line 21 after ἑαυτοῖς, so the total is reduced to 435. The difference between 435 and 544 is considerable.

If we treat *D* in the same way the total is $514 - 13$, i.e. 501 letters. In this calculation the symbols γ̅ (τρεῖς Γ) in *v.* 8 and ε̅ (= πέμπτης) in *v.* 9 are treated as single letters. *D*, therefore, still falls short of 544.

If we add to *D*'s total of 501 the 66 extra letters contained in *c.Th.*, xix. 6, we get $501 + 66 = 567$, which is more satisfactory. It is a curious fact that if we omit from this the words καὶ ἐπεγίνωσκον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, for which *c.Th.* is the sole authority (= 23 letters), we get absolute agreement ($501 + 43 = 544$). It is easy to see how, if an ancestor had

και επεγινωσκον εν εαυτοις
ωστε και ερμηνευειν αυτας εαυτοις

the first στίχος might drop out.

(3) CODEX THOMAE (*c.Th.*)

I adopt the symbol *c.Th.* to denote a Greek MS. belonging to the Enaton monastery near Alexandria, which was used by Thomas of Harkel in A.D. 616. The variants which he extracted from it show that it was very closely connected with *D* and the Michigan papyrus. His marginalia form one of the chief sources for our knowledge of the *Z* text in Acts.

Various complicated questions which arise concerning the work of Thomas upon the N.T. will be discussed later on. It will be sufficient here to say that, according to his own statement, he had before him a Syriac translation of the N.T. made in A.D. 508 by order of Philoxenus, Bishop of Hierapolis, which he collated with certain MSS. In his colophon to Evv. he specifies two (or three) Greek MSS. used by him, and in his notes to the text occasionally refers to an old Syriac MS. as another authority. In his colophon to Acts he mentions only one authority, viz., a Greek MS. which was in the Enaton. This account is borne out by the internal evidence. The marginalia in Evv. form a farrago of miscellaneous variants, those in Acts are homogeneous.

It is unfortunate that, while we have good evidence for the marginalia of Thomas in Evv., where they are comparatively unimportant, in Acts they rest upon the testimony of a single MS., written in the eleventh century. It is *prima facie* likely that this has suffered from corruptions in the course of transmission, and the discovery of a new, and possibly superior, MS. is much to be hoped for.

Before going further, I offer a few remarks upon the method followed by Thomas in making his collation from the Enaton MS.

The Philoxenian version (𝔖^{ph}) used by him already contained in Acts a large number of notable readings taken from a *Z* source. On such occasions he either maintains silence as to the reading of his MS., or only quotes a minute variant from it. Thus in xviii. 27 *c.Th.* is quoted for several *Z* readings found in *D* and the Michigan papyrus: for one, however, (εἰς τὴν 'Αχαΐαν) *c.Th.* is not quoted, the reason being that the words were already in the text of the Philoxeniana (𝔖^{ph}). For small corrections we may take viii. 39 (*def. D*), where 𝔖^{ph} has an important *Z* reading, πνεῦμα ⟨κυρίου ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐνοῦχον, ἄγγελος δὲ⟩ κυρίου, and *c.Th.* is quoted for ἅγιον, in place of κυρίου (after πνεῦμα), which is peculiar to 𝔖^{ph}. So also in ix. 6, where 𝔖^{ph} has καὶ ὁ κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν with 𝔏^{hpt}, *Aug.* (*om. cett.*), *c.Th.* is quoted for ἔφη (εἶπεν) after κύριος.

I call attention here to a case which has been generally misunderstood, viz.: ix. 4, where 𝔖^{ph}, with *E*, 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug.*, *Hier.*, has σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν, Thomas annotates (I quote White's Latin):

'non est hoc loco in Graeco: sed ubi enarrat de se Paulus' (xxvi. 14).

Here *in Graeco* refers to the Enaton MS.

The collation of Thomas was clearly by no means exhaustive, and little, if any, weight can be attached to his silence. Also, his choice of variants seems somewhat capricious, since some of his quotations deal with trifling points. The great majority, however, are important *Z* readings.

I now proceed to tabulate the marginalia. For the sake of uniformity I give them in Greek throughout, i.e. whether this Greek actually exists in *D* or elsewhere, or is a retranslation from the Syriac. In a few cases only, where the Greek equivalent is uncertain, I quote White's Latin rendering.

(1) I take first agreements of *c.Th.* with *D*, *alii.*

(*a*) Important cases:

i. 2 *καὶ ἐκέλευσεν κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον D c.Th.*, 𝔏gt, *Aug. Ephr.*: *om. cett.*

ii. 12 *ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι D c.Th.*, *Aug. Ephr.*: *om. cett.*

37 *τότε πάντες οἱ συνελθόντες D c.Th.*: *om. cett.* (*στ.* in *D*).

ib. *ὑποδείξατε ἡμῖν D c.Th. E*, 𝔏gpt: *om. cett.* (*στ.*).

iv. 18 *συγκατατιθεμένων δὲ αὐτῶν τῇ γνώμῃ D c.Th.*, 𝔏gh: *om. cett.* (*στ.*).

vi. 10 *διὰ τὸ ἐλέγχεσθαι αὐτοὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας· μὴ δυνάμενοι οὖν ἀντοφθαλμεῖν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ D c.Th.*, 𝔏ht: *cf. E*: *om. cett.* (3 *στ.*).

viii. 24 *ὃς πολλὰ κλαίων οὐ διελίμπανεν D c.Th.*, *Tert.*: *om. cett.* (*στ.*).

x. 25 *προσεγγίζοντος δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν προδραμὼν εἷς τῶν δούλων διεσάφησεν παραγεγονέναι αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ Κορνήλιος ἐκπηδήσας καὶ συναντήσας αὐτῷ D c.Th.*: *ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν τὸν Πέτρον συναντήσας αὐτῷ ὁ Κορνήλιος cett.*

xi. 25–6 *ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι Σαῦλός ἐστιν εἰς Ταρσὸν ἐξῆλθεν ἀναζητῶν αὐτόν. καὶ* (+*ὡς D*) *συντυχὼν παρεκάλεσεν ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν· οἵτινες παραγενόμενοι ἐνιαυτὸν ὅλον συνεχύθησαν D c.Th.*, 𝔏p: *ἐξῆλθεν δὲ εἰς Ταρσὸν ἀναζητῆσαι Σαῦλον καὶ εὑρὼν ἤγαγεν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν. ἐγένετο δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐνιαυτὸν ὅλον συναχθῆναι cett.*

xii. 3 *ἡ ἐπιχείρησις αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς πιστοὺς D c.Th.*, 𝔏p: *om. cett.* (*στ.*)

xiii. 29 For this interesting passage I refer to the text. The full *Z* reading is obtained by a combination of *D* and *c.Th.*, while Γ *cett.* abbreviate.

33 *αἴτησαι παρ' ἐμοῦ καὶ δώσω σοι ἔθνη τὴν κληρονομίαν σου καὶ τὴν κατάσχεσίν σου τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς D c.Th.*: *om. cett.* (5 *στ.*).

43 *ἐγένετο δὲ καθ' ὅλης τῆς πόλεως διελθεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ* (*om. τοῦ θεοῦ c.Th.*) *D c.Th.*, *cf. E*: *om. cett.* (2 *στ.*).

xiv. 2 *D* here gives:

οι δε αρχισυναγωγοι των ιουδαιων
και οι αρχοντες της συναγωγης
επηγαγον αυτοις διωγμον κατα των δικαιων

Here *αὐτοῖς* is a variant for *κατὰ τῶν δικαίων*, a reading attested by Ephrem. *C.Th.* agrees with *D*, except that it omits *τῶν Ἰουδαίων* in *στ.* 1, *τῆς συναγωγῆς* in *στ.* 2, and *κατὰ τῶν δικαίων*, as well as *αὐτοῖς*, in *στ.* 3.[1] Γ, *cett.* give *οἱ δὲ ἀπειθήσαντες* (-*θοῦντες*) *Ἰουδαῖοι ἐπήγειραν* (*sine διωγμόν*).

ib. *ὁ δὲ κύριος ἔδωκεν ταχὺ εἰρήνην D c.Th.*, 𝔏gp, *cf. E*: *om. cett.* (*στ.*).

4 *κολλώμενοι διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ D c.Th.*: *om. cett.*

10 *σοὶ λέγω ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ D c.Th. CE* δ, 𝔏hp, 𝔖vg, 𝔈: *om.* ℵ *AB*, 𝔏g.

[1] It is somewhat curious that *c.Th.* omits words at the ends of three consecutive *στίχοι* in *D*.

xiv. 19 διατριβόντων δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ διδασκόντων *D c.Th. CE*, 𝔏[h] : *om. cett.* (στ.).

xv. 2 ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος μένειν οὕτως καθὼς ἐπίστευσαν διϊσχυριζόμενος, οἱ δὲ ἐληλυθότες ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ *D c.Th., Ephr.* (*cf.* 𝔏[g]) : *om. cett.* (3 στ.).

26 εἰς πάντα πειρασμόν *D c.Th. E* δ: *om. cett.* (στ.).

41 παραδιδοὺς (+τε *c.Th.*) τὰς ἐντολὰς τῶν (+ἀποστόλων καί *c.Th.*, 𝔏[g]) πρεσβυτέρων *D c.Th.*, 𝔏[g]: *om. cett.* (στ.).

xvi. 1 διελθὼν (-θόντες *c.Th.*) δὲ τὰ ἔθνη ταῦτα *D c.Th.*, 𝔏[g], *Ephr.*: *om. cett.* (στ.).

4 ἐκήρυσσον αὐτοῖς] ἐκήρυσσον καὶ παρεδίδοσαν αὐτοῖς *D*: κηρύσσοντες *c.Th.*: παρεδίδοσαν αὐτοῖς *cett.* *D* here conflates.

ib. μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν *D c.Th.*: *om. cett.* (στ.).

35 συνῆλθον οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν καὶ ἀναμνησθέντες τὸν σεισμὸν τὸν γεγονότα ἐφοβήθησαν *D c.Th., Ephr.*: *om. cett.*

xviii. 2 καὶ (οἳ καί *D*) κατῴκησαν εἰς τὴν Ἀχαΐαν *D c.Th.*, 𝔏[h] : *om. cett.* (στ.).

4 ἐντιθεὶς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ *D c.Th.*, 𝔏[gh] : *om. cett.* (στ.).

6 πολλοῦ δὲ λόγου γινομένου καὶ γραφῶν διερμηνευομένων *D c.Th.*, 𝔏[h] : *om. cett.* (2 στ.).

27 ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἐφέσῳ ἐπιδημοῦντές τινες Κορίνθιοι καὶ ἀκούσαντες αὐτοῦ παρεκάλουν διελθεῖν σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτῶν *D c.Th.*: βουλομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ διελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Ἀχαΐαν *cett.*

ib. συγκατανεύσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ οἱ Ἐφέσιοι (οἱ ἀδελφοί *c.Th.*) ἔγραψαν τοῖς ἐν Κορίνθῳ μαθηταῖς ὅπως ἀποδέξωνται τὸν ἄνδρα *D c.Th.*: προτρεψάμενοι οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἔγραψαν τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἀποδέξασθαι αὐτόν *cett.*

xix. 1 θέλοντος δέ . . . εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν *D pap. c.Th., Ephr.*: ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν Ἀπόλλω εἶναι ἐν Κορίνθῳ Παῦλον *cett.* For this passage cf. p. xxiii.

2 λαμβάνουσίν τινες *D pap. c.Th.*: ἔστιν *cett.*

8 ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλῃ *D c.Th.*: *om. cett.*

14 ἐν οἷς καὶ υἱοὶ (+ἑπτά *c.Th.*) Σκευᾶ τινος ἱερέως ἠθέλησαν τὸ αὐτὸ ποιῆσαι *D c.Th.* For the readings of *pap.* and Γ, *cett.* cf. p. 222.

ib. ἔθος . . . ἐξελθεῖν *D pap. c.Th.*: *om. cett.* (5 στ.). For this passage cf. pp. 222–3.

28 δραμόντες εἰς τὸ ἄμφοδον *D c.Th.* δ : *om. cett.*

xx. 3 εἶπεν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῷ ὑποστρέφειν *D c.Th.*, 𝔏[g], *Ephr.*: ἐγένετο γνώμης τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν *cett.*

xxi. 16 καὶ παραγενόμενοι εἴς τινα κώμην ἐγενόμεθα παρὰ Μνάσωνί τινι Κυπρίῳ, μαθητῇ ἀρχαίῳ· κἀκεῖθεν ἐξιόντες ἤλθομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα *D c.Th.* Γ, *cett.* omit καὶ παραγενόμενοι . . . κώμην (στ.) and κἀκεῖθεν ἐξιόντες with consequential botching.

(*b*) Minor cases:

i. 15 ἐν δέ *D c.Th. E*: καὶ ἐν *cett.* ii. 6 ταῖς γλώσσαις *D c.Th.*, 𝔖[vg], 𝔈: τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ *cett.* iii. 13 εἰς κρίσιν (κριτήριον *E*) *D c.Th. E*, 𝔏[hp]: *om. cett.* 17 πονηρόν *D c.Th.*, 𝔏[ghp] : *om. cett.* iv. 1 τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα (*sim.*) *D c.Th. E*, 𝔏[ghp]: *om. cett.* vi. 4 προσκαρτεροῦντες (-οῦμεν *c.Th.*) *D c.Th.*, 𝔏[ghp] : προσκαρτερήσομεν *cett.* vii. 17 ἐπηγγείλατο *D c.Th. E*: ὤμοσεν δ, 𝔏[g], 𝔖[ph] :

ὡμολόγησεν *cett.* x. 11 λαμπράν 𝔏[d] (*def. D*) *c.Th.*, 𝔏[gp] : μεγάλην *cett.* x. 24 περιέμεινεν *D c.Th.*, 𝔏[p] : *om. cett.* xii. 20 οἱ δὲ ὁμοθυμαδόν *D c.Th.* 𝔏[gp] : ὁμοθ. δέ *cett.* xiii. 5 ὑπηρετοῦντα αὐτοῖς *D c.Th.* 614, 𝔏[p], 𝔖[vg] : ὑπηρέτην *cett.* 39 οὖν *D c.Th.* 614 : *om. cett.* ib. παρὰ θεῷ *D c.Th.* δ : *om. cett.* xiv. 10 καὶ περιπάτει *D c.Th.*, 𝔏[h] : *om. cett.* 19 Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπὸ Ἰκονίου καὶ Ἀντιοχείας *D c.Th.*, 𝔏[h], 𝔖[vg] : ἀπὸ Ἀντιοχ. καὶ Ἰκον. Ἰουδαῖοι *cett.* ib. ἐπισείσαντες *D c.Th.*, 𝔏[gh], 𝔖[vg] : πείσαντες *cett.* xv. 1 περιπατῆτε *D c.Th.*, 𝔈 : *om. cett.* 7 ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ (*om.* ἁγίῳ *D*) *D c.Th.* 614 : *om. cett.* 18 τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ *D c.Th.* *A* : πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ *E* δ, 𝔏[g], 𝔖[ph] : *om.* ℵ *BC*, 𝔈 23 ἐπιστολήν *D c.Th.* *C* δ, 𝔏[g] : *om. cett.* ib. περιέχουσαν τάδε *D c.Th.* *C* δ, 𝔏[g] : *om.* ℵ *AB* xvi. 11 τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον *D c.Th.* δ : *om. cett.* xvii. 17 τοῖς ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ *D c.Th.* δ : ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ *cett.* xix. 37 ἐνθάδε *D c.Th.* δ, 𝔈 : *om. cett.* xxi. 21 αὐτοῦ *D c.Th.* : τοῦ νόμου 𝔖[vg] : *om. cett.* xxii. 11 ἀνέστην 𝔏[d] (*def. D*), *c.Th.*, 𝔏[g], 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

(*c*) I take last two curious cases :

xii. 25 *D* has :

βαρναβας δε και σαυλος
απεστρεψεν απο ιερουσαλημ
πληρωσαντες την διακονιαν

(In στ. 2 ἀπ- is a scribal error for ὑπ-.) The 3rd person sing. is odd after the two subjects, especially as the plural participle follows in στ. 3. Γ, *cett.* have ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ : *c.Th.* gives ὑπέστρεψεν εἰς Ἰερ., conflating the variants.

xiv. 10 εὐθέως παραχρῆμα *D* : statim eadem hora *c.Th.* (White) : παραχρῆμα *E* : *om. cett.* Here *D* conflates two synonyms, while *c.Th.* disguises the conflation.

(2) I proceed to agreements of *c.Th.* with other members of *Z*, where *D* is extant :

(*a*) Important cases :

iii. 6 Πέτρος *cett.* (*D*) : + πρὸς αὐτόν (αὐτῷ) *c.Th.*, 𝔏[gh], 𝔖[vg], 𝔈, *Cypr.*

iv. 10 ἐν ἄλλῳ δὲ οὐδενί *c.Th.* *E* (*sim.*), 𝔏[h], *Cypr.* : *om. cett.* (*D*).

x. 17 Κορνηλίου *cett.* (*D*) : + προσελθόντες καί *c.Th.*, 𝔏[p].

26 τί ποιεῖς ; *D* : ἀνάστηθι *cett.* : τί ποιεῖς ; ἀνάστηθι *c.Th.*, 𝔏[p].

xi. 5 λαμπράν *c.Th.* : λαμπρὰν (*del. m.* 2) μεγάλην 𝔏[p] : μεγάλην *cett.* (*D*).

xii. 7 ἐπέλαμψεν (*sim.*) *cett.* (*D*) : + ἀπ' αὐτοῦ *c.Th.*, 𝔏[gp].

11 καὶ ὁ Πέτρος *cett.* (*D*) : τότε ὁ Πέτρος *c.Th.*, 𝔏[p], 𝔖[vg].

xiv. 18 ἀλλὰ πορεύεσθαι ἕκαστον εἰς τὰ ἴδια *c.Th.* *C* δ, 𝔏[h] : *om. cett.* (*D*).

19 καὶ διαλεγομένων αὐτῶν παρρησίᾳ ἔπεισαν τοὺς ὄχλους ἀποστῆναι ἀπ' αὐτῶν, λέγοντες ὅτι οὐδὲν ἀληθὲς λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ πάντα ψεύδονται *c.Th.* *C*, 𝔏[h] (*sim.*) : *om. cett.* (*D*).

22 ὅτι *cett.* (*D*) : λέγοντες ὅτι *c.Th.*, 𝔏[h] (?), 𝔖[vg], 𝔈.

xv. 1 Ἰουδαίας *cett.* (*D*) : + τῶν πεπιστευκότων ἀπὸ τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων *c.Th.* δ.

xv. 23 καὶ πέμψαντες *c.Th.* δ : *om. cett.* (*D*).

xviii. 2 οὗτοι δὲ ἐξῆεσαν ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης *c.Th.*, 𝔏ʰ : *om. cett.* (*D*).

3 ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἐγνώσθη τῷ Ἀκύλᾳ *c.Th.*, 𝔏ʰ, *spec.* : *om. cett.* (*D*).

22 τὸν δὲ Ἀκύλαν εἴασεν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ *c.Th.* δ (*sim.*), 𝔖ᵛᵍ : *om. cett.* (*D*).

ib. αὐτὸς δὲ ἀναχθεὶς ἦλθεν εἰς Καισάρειαν *c.Th.*, 𝔖ᵛᵍ : καὶ κατελθὼν εἰς Καισ. *cett.* (*D*).

xix. 6 ὥστε καὶ ἑρμηνεύειν αὐτὰς ἑαυτοῖς *c.Th.*, 𝔏ᵖ, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (*D*).

xxii. 7 φωνῆς *cett.* (*D*) : + διαλέκτῳ Ἑβραΐδι *c.Th.*, 𝔏ᵍ. The addition appears to come from xxi. 40.

It is to be noticed that the extra matter in xiv. 18, 19, xv. 23, and xviii. 2, 3 comes at the end of a στίχος in *D*. The presumption is that *D* has omitted στίχοι which have been preserved by *c.Th.* and other allies. The variants in iv. 10–11 are due to the transposition of a στ. by *cett.* (*D*). In xi. 5 it is clear that *c.Th.* has the original *Z* reading (λαμπράν), while *D* has been brought into harmony with Γ, *cett.* The same explanation applies to more complicated passages, e.g. xviii. 22 and xix. 6. Some of the smaller additions of *c.Th.* do not inspire confidence, e.g. iii. 6, x. 17, xiv. 22, xxii. 7. In x. 26 it appears to conflate two variants.

(*b*) Minor cases, mostly doubtful readings:

iii. 14 ᾐτήσατε (-σασθε) *cett.* (*D*) : + μᾶλλον *c.Th. E* vii. 25 αὐτοῦ (*om.* ℵ *BC*) *cett.* (*D*) : + τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ (*ex v.* 23) *c.Th.*, 𝔖ᵛᵍ xiii. 4 ἐκεῖθεν *D* : κἀκεῖθεν 614 : ἐκεῖθεν δέ *c.Th.* 383 : ἐκεῖθέν τε *cett.* xiv. 18 λέγοντες *cett.* (*D*) : εἰπόντες *c.Th.* 614 xv. 24 ἐξελθόντες (*om.* ℵ *B*) *cett.* (*D*) : + πρὸς ἡμᾶς *c.Th.* 𝔈 xvii. 26 ἔθνος *cett.* (*D*) : γένος *c.Th.* δ, *Iren.* xviii. 3 ὁμότεχνον *cett.* (*D*) : ὁμόφυλον καὶ ὁμότεχνον *c.Th.*, *spec.* 5 λόγῳ *cett.* (*D*) : πνεύματι *c.Th.* 383.

To these may be added xvii. 9 τὸ ἱκανόν *cett.* (*D*) : *sponsores* (White) *c.Th.*, so also 𝔖ᵛᵍ.

(3) In the absence of *D* the chief agreements of *c.Th.* are with δ (especially 614) and with 𝔏ᵍʰ. There are also some important cases in which *c.Th.* is supported by *vg.*ᵃ (the Book of Armagh) and *vg.*ᵇᵒʰ (the Bohemian version).

viii. 39 ἀπ' αὐτοῦ *c.Th.*, 𝔏ᵖ. : *om. cett.*

xxi. 10 ἡμῶν *c.Th. E* δ, 𝔏ᵍ, 𝔈 : αὐτῶν ℵ : *om. ABC*, 𝔖ᵖʰ.

xxiii. 15 ἐρωτῶμεν ὑμᾶς ἵνα τοῦτο ἡμῖν ποιήσητε· συναγαγόντες τὸ συνέδριον ἐμφανίσατε τῷ χιλιάρχῳ *c.Th.*, 𝔏ᵍʰ, 𝔈 : ὑμεῖς ἐμφανίσατε τῷ χιλιάρχῳ σὺν τῷ συνεδρίῳ Γ, *cett.*

ib. ἐὰν δέῃ καὶ (+ ἡμᾶς 𝔏ʰ) ἀποθανεῖν *c.Th.* 614, 𝔏ʰ : *om. cett.*

23 ἑκατόν *c.Th.* 614, 𝔏ʰ, 𝔈 : ἑβδομήκοντα *cett.*

ib. κελεύει ἑτοίμους εἶναι πορεύεσθαι *c.Th.*, 𝔏ʰ : *om. cett.*

24 καὶ τοῖς ἑκατοντάρχοις παρήγγειλεν *c.Th.*, 𝔏ʰ : *om. cett.*

ib. διὰ νυκτός *c.Th.* 614, 𝔏ʰ : *om. cett.*

25 ἔγραψεν δέ (τε) *c.Th.*, 𝔏ᵍ, 𝔖ᵛᵍ : γράψας *cett.*

29 Μωσέως καὶ Ἰησοῦ τινός *c.Th.* 614, 𝔏ᵍ : αὐτῶν *cett.*

34 ἀναγνοὺς δὲ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐπηρώτησεν· ἐκ ποίας ἐπαρχίας εἶ; ἔφη, Κίλιξ· καὶ πυθόμενος ἔφη *c.Th.* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ἀναγνοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐπερωτήσας ἐκ ποίας ἐπαρχίας ἐστίν, καὶ πυθόμενος ὅτι ἀπὸ Κιλικίας *cett.*

35 ὅταν *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ἔφη, ὅταν *cett.*

xxiv. 24 ἥτις ἠρώτησεν ἰδεῖν τὸν Παῦλον καὶ ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον (*om.* τὸν λόγον $vg.^{boh}$) *c.Th.*, $vg.^{boh}$: *om. cett.*

27 τὸν δὲ Παῦλον εἴασεν ἐν τηρήσει διὰ Δρούσιλλαν *c.Th.* 614 : θέλων τε χάριτα καταθέσθαι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὁ Φῆλιξ κατέλιπε τὸν Π. δεδεμένον *cett.* (*ex* xxv. 9).

xxv. 23 ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Φῆστος ἀχθῆναι τὸν Παῦλον *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: καὶ κελεύσαντος τοῦ Φήστου ἤχθη ὁ Παῦλος *cett.*

24–5 ὅπως παραδῶ αὐτὸν εἰς βάσανον ἀναπολόγητον· οὐκ ἠδυνήθην δὲ παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν διὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς ἃς ἔχομεν παρὰ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ. ἐὰν δέ τις αὐτοῦ κατηγορεῖν θέλῃ, ἔλεγον ἀκολουθεῖν μοι εἰς Καισάρειαν (*hactenus* $vg.^{boh}$) οὗ ἐφυλάσσετο· οἵτινες ἐλθόντες ἐβόων ἵνα ἀρθῇ ἐκ τῆς ζωῆς *c.Th.*, $vg.^{a,boh}$ (*sim.*) : βοῶντες μὴ δεῖν αὐτὸν ζῆν μηκέτι *cett.*

xxvi. 14 διὰ τὸν φόβον εἰς τὴν γῆν *c.Th.* : εἰς τὴν γῆν διὰ τὸν φόβον 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *om. cett.*

ib. ἐγὼ μόνος *c.Th.* 614 : *om. cett.*

xxvii. 1 οὕτως οὖν ἔκρινεν ὁ ἡγεμὼν ἀναπέμπεσθαι αὐτὸν Καίσαρι *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp2}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.*

ib. καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: ὡς δὲ ἐκρίθη τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν *cett.* (*om.* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$).

ib. σὺν καὶ ἑτέροις δεσμώταις *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$: καί τινας ἑτέρους δεσμώτας *cett.*

It cannot be doubted that the great majority of these variants are genuine *Z* readings.

(4) I now come to readings peculiar to *c.Th.* I take first important cases.

(*a*) Where *D* is extant:

xiii. 29 σταυρωθέντος δὲ ᾐτοῦντο τὸν Πιλᾶτον ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου καθελεῖν αὐτόν *c.Th.* : *om. cett.* (*D*).

xiv. 5–6 καὶ πάλιν ἐπήγειραν διωγμὸν ἐκ δευτέρου οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι σὺν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καὶ λιθοβολήσαντες ἐξέβαλον αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ φυγόντες ἦλθον εἰς τὴν Λυκαονίαν εἰς πόλιν τινα καλουμένην Λύστραν καὶ Δέρβην *c.Th.* : ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο ὁρμὴ τῶν ἐθνῶν τε καὶ Ἰουδαίων σὺν τοῖς ἄρχουσιν αὐτῶν ὑβρίσαι καὶ λιθοβολῆσαι αὐτούς, συνιδόντες κατέφυγον εἰς τὰς πόλεις τῆς Λυκαονίας Λύστραν καὶ Δέρβην *cett.* (*D sim.*). The words καὶ πάλιν . . . διωγμόν are peculiar to *c.Th.* : also small differences in collocation, etc.

xvii. 9 οἱ μὲν οὖν πολιτάρχαι *c.Th.* (*cf. Ephr.*) : *om. cett.* (*D*).

xix. 6 καὶ ἐπεγίνωσκον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς *c.Th.* : *om. cett.* (*D*). These words are also omitted by $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, which has preserved part of the *Z* reading in this context (*cf.* p. 225).

I regard all these variants of *c.Th.* as genuine *Z* readings. It is to be noted that xiii. 29 and xvii. 9 come at the end of a στ. in *D*.

(*b*) Where *D* is no longer extant:

xxiv. 10 *ἀπολογίαν ἔχειν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ c.Th.*: *λέγειν cett.*

ib. *ὁ δὲ σχῆμα ἔνθεον ἀναλαβὼν ἔφη c.Th.*: *om. cett.*

ib. *ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν εἶ κριτὴς τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ c.Th.*: *ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν ὄντα σε κριτὴν* (+*δίκαιον* *E* 614, 𝔖[ph]) *τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ ἐπιστάμενος cett.*

24 *θέλων οὖν χαρίζεσθαι αὐτῇ c.Th.*: *om. cett.* The words do not appear in *vg.*[boh], which has preserved part of the *Z* reading here (*cf. supr.*).

xxv. 3 *κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν*] +illi qui votum fecerant se pro virili [facturos esse] ut in manibus suis esset (White) *c.Th.*

23 *τοῖς καταβεβηκόσιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπαρχίας c.Th.*: *om. cett.*

25 After the long passage already (3) given in which *c.Th.* is supported by *vg.*[a, boh] (*ὅπως παραδῶ . . . ἐκ τῆς ζωῆς*) *ἀκούσας δὲ ἀμφοτέρων κατελαβόμην ἐν μηδενὶ αὐτὸν ἔνοχον εἶναι θανάτου. εἰπόντος δέ μου· Θέλεις κρίνεσθαι μετ' αὐτῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις; Καίσαρα ἐπεκαλέσατο c.Th.*: *ἐγὼ δὲ κατελαβόμην μηδὲν ἄξιον αὐτὸν θανάτου πεπραχέναι, αὐτοῦ δὲ τούτου ἐπικαλεσαμένου τὸν Σεβαστὸν ἔκρινα πέμπειν cett.*

xxvi. 1 *θαρρῶν καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ παράκλησιν λαβὼν c.Th.*: *om. cett.*

I regard all these readings as genuine except xxiv. 10 (*tertio loco*), where *εἶ κριτὴς* seems due to botching after omission of *ἐπιστάμενος*, and xxv. 3, which seems to be an interpolation.

To these may be added some minor cases.

(*a*) Where *D* is extant:

ii. 13 *γλεύκους οὗτοι μεμεστωμένοι εἰσίν*] *μεθύουσιν c.Th.* vi. 7 *τῇ πίστει*] +*τοῦ εὐαγγελίου c.Th.* vii. 60 *κύριε*]+*Ἰησοῦ c.Th.* x. 16 *τὸ σκεῦος*] *πᾶν τὸ σκεῦος c.Th.* 30 *ἀνήρ*] *ἄγγελος c.Th.* 46 *μεγαλυνόντων*] *δοξαζόντων c.Th.* xv. 5 *ἐξανέστησαν*] +*κατὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων c.Th.* ib. *λέγοντες*] *ὄντες c.Th.* xvii. 8 *ἀκούοντας*] *λέγοντες c.Th.* 27 *εὕροιεν*] +*τίς εἴη c.Th.* xix. 6 *τινὲς δέ c.Th.*: *om. cett.* 18 *ἤρχοντο*] *ἤρξαντο c.Th.* xx. 4 *Ἐφέσιοι* *D*, 𝔈: *Ἀσιανοί cett.*: *ἐξ Ἀσίας Ἐφέσιοι c.Th.*

(*b*) Where *D* is no longer extant:

xxiv. 12 *κατὰ τὴν πόλιν*] *ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ c.Th.* 14 *αἵρεσιν*] *καὶ αἵρεσιν c.Th.* xxv. 16 *κατηγορούμενος*] *κρινόμενος c.Th.* xxvii. 1 *Ἰουλίῳ*] *Ἰουλιανῷ c.Th.* xxviii. 9 *γενομένου*] *ἀκουστοῦ γενομένου c.Th.*

Only a few of these variants are attractive.

(5) In two cases *c.Th.* is found in the company of 𝔖[vg], viz.:

xxiii. 25 *ἔχουσαν τὸν τύπον τοῦτον*] *περιέχουσαν τάδε* 614: *ἐν ᾗ ταῦτα c.Th.*, 𝔖[vg].

xxvii. 42 *μή τις ἐκκολυμβήσας διαφύγῃ cett.* (𝔖[ph]): +*ἐξ αὐτῶν post τις c.Th.*, *post διαφ.* 𝔖[vg]

(6) I mention here three cases in which, if the MS. reading is correctly given, *c.Th.* omits words found in *cett.*:

xiv. 6 *καὶ τὴν περίχωρον ὅλην* (*στ.*).

xv. 2 καὶ πρεσβυτέρους εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ.

xvii. 9 παρὰ τοῦ Ἰάσονος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν.

I lay no stress on these omissions, which may be due to error in the single MS.

(7) I now take cases where *c.Th.* agrees with Γ, or members of Γ.

(*a*) Where *D* is extant:

ii. 8 ἐγεννήθημεν *cett.* (*D*) : ἐγενήθημεν *c.Th.* ℵ *AE* 33 ὅ *D*: τοῦτο ὅ *c.Th.* Γ δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: τοῦτο τὸ δῶρον ὅ *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{pt}$, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$ vii. 18 ἕτερος *DE* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: + ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον *c.Th.*, *cett.* viii. 24 θεόν *D* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}$: κύριον *c.Th.*, *cett.* x. 5 Σίμωνα *cett.* (*D*): + τινα *c.Th.* *ABC* 16 πάλιν *D* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: εὐθύς *c.Th.* Γ *E* 19 ἄνδρες *D* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: + τρεῖς (δύο *B*) *c.Th.*, *cett.* xii. 9 διά *cett.* (*D*): ὑπό *c.Th.* *A* 25 ἀπό *D*, *cett.*: εἰς *c.Th.* xix. 14 υἱοί *D*: + ἑπτά (δύο $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) *c.Th.*, *cett.*

To these may be added x. 24 εἰσῆλθεν *DB*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: εἰσῆλθον *c.Th.* ℵ *AC*, *cett.*

(*b*) Where *D* is no longer extant:

xxiv. 24 τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ *c.Th.* ℵ *E*: τῇ ἰδίᾳ γῦναικί (+ αὐτοῦ *A*) *AB* : τῇ γυναικί *C* δ xxvi. 28 ποιῆσαι *c.Th.* Γ: γενέσθαι *E* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}$ xxvii. 8 Λασαία] Ἄλασσα (-ασα *c.Th.*) *c.Th.* *A*.

It will be seen that the agreements of *c.Th.* with Γ are few and generally insignificant.

(8) I have reserved until the end of this discussion some insignificant variants similar to those previously mentioned (viii. 39, ix. 6, *v.* p. 226) where *c.Th.* corrects small points in $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$. I give White's Latin in cases where the difference between the variants is not clear.

iii. 25 πατριαί] tribus $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: gentes *c.Th.* v. 10 αὐτοῦ *cett.* (*c.Th.*): τοῦ ἀποστόλου $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ x. 22 τε *cett.* (*c.Th.*) : *om.* $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ xxi. 36 τὸ πλῆθος] turba $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: populus *c.Th.* xxiii. 7 τὸ πλῆθος] turba $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: multitudo *c.Th.* xxiv. 17 δι' ἐτῶν] post annos $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: per annos *c.Th.* xxv. 6 ἐν αὐτοῖς] inter eos $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: apud eos *c.Th.* xxviii. 6 θεωρούντων] viderent $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: intuiti essent *c.Th.* 30 δέ *cett.* (*c.Th.*): οὖν $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$.

A few variants with wider attestation ($\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ + *alii*) are corrected in the same way:

i. 25 τόπον *cett.* (*c.Th.*) : κλῆρον $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ (+ ℵ *E* δ) xi. 3 εἰσῆλθες . . . συνέφαγες *cett.* (*c.Th.*): εἰσῆλθεν . . . συνέφαγεν $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ (+ *B* 614, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$) xiii. 26 ἡμῖν *cett.* (*c.Th.*): ὑμῖν $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ (+ *CE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$) xviii. 7 εἰσῆλθεν *cett.* (*c.Th.*): ἦλθεν $\mathfrak{S}^{h}$ (+ *BE* δ) xx. 4 Πύρρου *cett.* (*c.Th.*): *om.* $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ (+ δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$) 28 κυρίου *cett.* (*c.Th.*): θεοῦ $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ (+ ℵ *B* δ) xxiii. 12 λέγοντες *cett.* (*c.Th.*): *om.* $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ (+ *C*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$).

(4) LAUDIANUS 35 (*E*)

E like *D* is a bilingual MS. It differs from *D* in two obvious respects, viz.: (*a*) the Latin side occupies the left column, not the right as in *D*; (*b*) the lines are exceedingly short, generally consisting of one or two words, sometimes of three or even four. An interesting parallel to this formation occurs in *pap.* Rylands 61, cent. v, containing Cicero *in Catil.* ii. 14–18, in which the Latin text is on the left and a Greek translation is on the right,[1] and the lines consist of one, two, or three words. With regard to the provenance of the MS., it is known to have been in Sardinia at an early date,[2] but that is not a proof that it was written there. A precisely similar MS. was in the hands of Bede in England early in the eighth century, and it is generally assumed that this was *E*. This identification, however, is not certain, since his MS. may have been a *gemellus* of *E*. It is commonly held that after the time of Bede *E* migrated to the Continent, probably to Würzburg. The reason for this statement is that during the Thirty Years' War Laud acquired a large number of MSS. from the monastery of St. Kilian's, Würzburg, when the town had been sacked by the Swedish troops. This is highly probable, but not certain, since Laud's MSS. came from various sources.[3] He presented his magnificent collection of MSS. to the Bodleian Library at Oxford (1635–40).

Until recently *E* was looked upon as a first-rate witness to the *Z* text, second only to *D*. Thus, where *D* is not extant, Hilgenfeld places *E* at the head of his MSS. This view is no longer held. Ropes goes so far as to exclude the readings of *E*, i.e. the Greek side, from his Apparatus Criticus, and attaches superior value to the Latin side (𝕷^{e}), which he considers to be prior to it.

In order to shorten the discussion, it may be well to state some points which may be taken as now agreed upon:

(1) *E* (including 𝕷^{e}) is copied from a predecessor resembling it in formation.

(2) Certain notable *Z* readings which appear in *E* can only have been drawn from a version presumably, though not certainly, Latin. The proof is that in all such passages, where variation is possible, the Greek of *E* differs from that of *D*.

(3) Apart from this infiltration of *Z* readings and variants of unknown origin, *E* is in basis a Γ text.

(4) The writer of *E*, or of its ancestor, if not a Greek, was a good Greek scholar. His Latin on the other hand was very defective.

(5) There is a very remarkable similarity between 𝕷^{e}, 𝕷^{g}, and the Vulgate.

[1] E. A. Lowe in *Cl. R.* xxxvi (1922), p. 154, draws attention to two bilingual fragments of Virgil, one in the Rainer collection and the other in the Ambrosiana at Milan, in both of which the Latin occupies the left-hand column.

[2] This is shown by a note on the *verso* of the final fly-leaf: *φλαυιος πανκρατιος συν θεω απο επαρχων δουξ σαρδινιας δηλα ποιω τα υποτεταγμενα.*

[3] e.g. Mainz, Eberbach, Lorsch.

This can be seen at once from simple inspection. As this subject can best be treated in connexion with $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, I postpone proofs for the moment. Cf. pp. 271–2.

In the course of this discussion I shall have to make frequent reference to a valuable paper by A. Jülicher upon the Latin translations of the Acts.[1] Owing to the date of its publication (1914) it was unknown to me until 1923, when a paper by Ropes giving an account of its contents[2] was sent to me by Dr. Conybeare. At that time my own analysis was already made. It was a source of surprise to me and, I may say, of gratification to find that various conclusions of my own had been anticipated by Jülicher, notably in his discussion of (5).

With regard to Ropes's view of the relation between *E* and $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, I do not feel quite clear as to what exactly he means. On p. cxi all he says of $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ is that 'it is often the dominant member of the partnership'. Elsewhere (p. 83) he says 'the text of *E* is as usual a retranslation from *e*'. As it would manifestly be untenable to suppose that the ordinary Greek text could be produced by a retranslation from Latin, I take it to mean that he is referring only to passages absent from the current Greek text, but found in the Latin text on which $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ is based. This text, he tells us, was similar to $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and the Vulgate (p. cxi).

It has been already remarked that *E* was copied from a MS. similar in formation. The statement refers only to the arrangement of the lines, not to the number of lines in the page. This is clear from the fact that on several occasions a line or lines at the foot of a page are repeated at the beginning of the next page in the same formation. Two of these repetitions (ff. 167^{v}–168^{r}, 213^{v}–214^{r}) are quoted by Jülicher. Others occur on ff. 7^{v}–8^{r}, 63^{v}–64^{r}, 74^{r}–74^{v}, 85^{r}–85^{v}, 109^{v}–110^{r}, 217^{v}–218^{r}. Such errors show that the pagination of the model differed from that of *E*.

As I do not wish to occupy much space by a long analysis of *E*, I shall compress my remarks as much as is possible. I attach no importance to the fact that on one occasion (78^{v}, ix. 33)

paralyti*κους* | *παραλελυμενος*

we find Greek letters on the Latin side, or conversely on 116^{r} (xiii. 41)

ego | ego

Latin letters on the Greek side. Such errors are inevitable in a bilingual MS., as has been seen in the case of *D* and $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$. What appears to me to be more remarkable is that on two occasions there is nothing in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ to correspond to *E*. The chief case is xix. 35 (168^{v}):

et iouis e prolis	*και του διοσπετους*
. . . .	*αναντιρρητων*
. . . .	*οντων τουτων*
oportet	*δεον εστιν*

Here two lines in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ are blank. This seems odd, if $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ is prior to *E*. The other case occurs in xxii. 5 (190^{r}), where we find

[1] *Zeitschrift f. die neutest. Wissenschaft*, vol. xv (1914), pp. 163–88.
[2] *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, xvi (1923), pp. 176 sqq.

	. . . .	και τους εκισε
	constitutis	οντας
	uinctos	δεδεμενους

Here again we have a blank line in $\mathfrak{L}^e$.

I would now call attention to the following passages:

xiv. 6 (120^v)	et circatoria	και την περιχωρον
	tota	ολην

Here *-toria* appears to be a transliteration of -χωρον.

xvii. 16 (148^v)	circa simulacrum	κατειδωλον

The error in $\mathfrak{L}^e$ is due to confusion with κατ' εἴδωλον.

xviii. 10 (155^v)	oporte (= -et) quod	διοτι

Here there is a confusion with δεῖ ὅτι.

I now turn to Greek constructions to be found in $\mathfrak{L}^e$. (For the sake of brevity I do not reproduce the line division).

(*a*) *Genitive-absolutes* in $\mathfrak{L}^e$:

vi. 1 multiplicantium discipulorum
πληθυνοντων των μαθητων

xxii. 23 uociferantium autem eorum et proicientium . . . et mittentium
κραυγαζοντων δε αυτων και ριπτοντων . . . και βαλλοντων

xxiv. 2 correctionum fientium
διορθωματων γινομενων

xxv. 17 conuenientium enim eorum
συνελθοντων ουν αυτων

Similar constructions in $\mathfrak{L}^d$ are confined to Luke.

(*b*) *Mixture of genitive and ablative*:

v. 2 consciente et uxoris suae
συνιδυιης και της γυναικος αυτου

vi. 3 plenus spiritu sancto et sapientiae
πληρης πν̄ς αγιου και σοφιας

5 plenum fidei et spiritu sancto
πληρης πιστεως και πν̄ς αγιου

8 plenus gratia et fidei ac uirtute
πληρης χαριτος και πιστεως και δυναμεως

xii. 11 et de omni expectationis
και εκ πασης της προσδοκιας

13 pulsante autem petri
κρουσαντος δε του πετρου

xviii. 15 de uerbo et nominibus et legis
περι λογου και ονοματων και νομου

xxi. 5 deducentibus nos omnium
προπεμποντων ημας παντων

With these cases of mixture, we may compare others of simple confusion, e.g.:

vi. 11 audiuimus eo loquente
ακηκοαμεν αυτου λαλουντος

xix. 34 uox . . . una ex omnium . . . clamantium
φωνη . . . μια εκ παντων . . . κραζοντων

40 de congregationis istius
περι της συστροφης ταυτης

(*c*) *Greek genders* retained in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$:

vi. 1 factus est murmuratio
εγενετο γογγυσμος

viii. 18 datur spiritus sanctum
διδοται το πν̄α το αγιον

xiii. 46 uerbum . . . illum
τον λογον . . . αυτον

xxiii. 10 exercitum descendens
το στρατευμα καταβαν

(*d*) *Greek use of cases* reproduced in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$:

v. 3 mentire te spiritum
ψευσασθαι σε το πν̄α

xvi. 5 confirmabantur fidei
εστερεουντο τη πιστει

17 subsecuta paulo et nobis
κατακολουθησασα τω παυλω και ημιν

25 hymnum canebant deum
υμνουν τον θν̄

xvii. 11 nobiliores eorum
ευγενεστεροι των

xx. 4 comitabatur autem eo
συνειπετο δε αυτω

xxvi. 22 auxilio quoque nactus
επικουριας οὖν τυχων

(*e*) *Greek use of infinitive after* ὥστε and πρίν retained:

vii. 2 priusquam habitare eum
πριν η κατοικησαι αυτον

xv. 39 ita ut descendere eos
ωστε αποχωρησαι αυτους

xvi. 26 terrae motus factus est . . . ut moueri
σεισμος εγενετο . . . ωστε σαλευθηναι

(*f*) *Mixed constructions* found in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$:

x. 41 postquam surrexit eum
μετα το αναστηναι αυτον

x. 47	ne baptize[n]tur eos *του μη βαπτισθηναι τουτους*
xi. 12	ut irem . . . nihil dubitantem *συνελθειν . . . μηδεν διακρινοντα*
xii. 20	eo quod alerentur eorum ciuitatem *δια το τρεφεσθαι αυτων την πολιν*
xxiii. 15	priusquam adpropiet eum *προ του εγγισαι αυτον*
30	indicatis autem mihi de insidiis in uirum esse *μηνυθεισης δε μοι επιβουλης εις τον ανδρα εσεσθαι*

(*g*) *Attempts to translate the Greek article*, similar to those found in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$:

ix. 19	cum qui erant in damasco *μετα των εν δαμασκω*
x. 45	qui ex circumcisione *οι εκ περιτομης*
xiii. 1	quae erat et ecclesia *κατα την ουσαν εκκλησιαν*
32	eam quae . . . repromissione facta est *την . . . επαγγελιαν γενομενην*
xxiii. 4	qui autem circum *οι δε παρεστωτες*
21	expectantes quae a te repromissionem *προσδεχομενοι την απο σου επαγγελιαν*

(*h*) Attention may also be drawn to such obvious Graecisms as

v. 33	cogitabantur | *εβουλευοντο*
vii. 1	si enim haec ita habet | *ει αρα ταυτα οὕτως ἔχει*
xxi. 13	parate habeo | *ετοιμως εχω*
21	dicens ne debere | *λεγων μη οφειλειν*
35	cum autem factus ad gradus | *οτε δε εγενετο επι τους αναβαθμους*
xxiii. 12	dicentes ne manducare | *λεγοντες μητε φαγιν*

In all these cases it is obvious that $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ has been translated from *E*, and that with great fidelity. Since the discrepancies between *E* and $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ are trifling as compared with those which exist between *D* and $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, the probability is that in all cases where there is no difference between them $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ is a literal translation of *E*. It is somewhat surprising that the cumulative evidence furnished by this mass of testimony has been neglected, or kept in the background, in all works on the subject with which I am acquainted. On the other hand a prominent position is given to certain passages in which *E* appears to be dependent on $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$. The usual citations are :

vi. 7 discentium | *μανθανοντων*. This error for *μαθητῶν* is a clear case.

xii. 14 ianuam | *την θυραν* (*τὸν πυλῶνα cett.*). So iii. 2 *E* has *πύλην* for *θύραν* (*cett.*). Such errors are easy to explain. The translator had already written the Latin side and fell into a Latinism when adding the Greek. The explana-

tion is not so obvious when Graecisms are found in the Latin, since the Latin was written first.

Ropes adds to these:

xxiv. 25 tempore autem opportuno | καιρω δε επιτηδιω. He thinks that this variant for καιρὸν δὲ μεταλαβών (Γ) is a translation of 𝔏ᵉ. Since, however, the same reading occurs in 𝔖ᵛᵍ (as well as in Latin authorities) the instance does not seem felicitous.

As a matter of fact a large number of cases can be produced in which *E* substitutes a synonym for the word found in the other Greek MSS. The most instructive are those where 𝔏ᵉ does not agree with *E*, since it is here obvious that *E* cannot be a translation of 𝔏ᵉ. I have observed the following instances:

iv. 27 λαοῖς] λαός *E* (so *Hil. Aug.*): populo 𝔏ᵉ v. 18 ἐν τηρήσει] εἰς τήρησιν *E*: in custodia 𝔏ᵉ x. 38 διαβόλου] Σατανᾶ *E*: diabolo 𝔏ᵉ xv. 14 ἐπεσκέψατο] ἐπελέξατο *E*: prospexit 𝔏ᵉ xvii. 5 προαγαγεῖν] προσαγαγεῖν *E*: producere 𝔏ᵉ 29 ἀνθρώπου] ἀνθρώπων *E*: hominis 𝔏ᵉ xviii. 6 πρὸς αὐτούς] αὐτοῖς *E*: ad illos 𝔏ᵉ xx. 22 μοι] με *E*: mihi 𝔏ᵉ xxi. 13 γάρ] δέ *E*: enim 𝔏ᵉ xxiv. 25 τὸ νῦν] τοίνυν *E*: quod nunc 𝔏ᵉ xxv. 23 τοῖς κατ' ἐξοχήν] καὶ τοῖς κατ' ἐξ. *E*: principalibus 𝔏ᵉ.

The writer thought in Greek and consequently stumbled into originality. Familiarity led him into contempt.

Other cases in which there is no obvious discrepancy between *E* and e are:

i. 20 λαβέτω] λάβοι ii. 37 δέ] οὖν ib. εἶπόν τε] καὶ εἶπον v. 19 νυκτός] τῆς νυκτός vii. 33 κύριος] θεός 35 ἐφ' ἡμῶν] ἐφ' ἡμᾶς 40 ὃς ἐξήγαγεν] ὁ ἐξαγαγών viii. 21 μερίς] μέρος x. 33 ὑπό] παρά xiii. 5 ὑπηρέτην] εἰς διακονίαν 13 ἀποχωρήσας] ἀναχωρήσας 51 ἐπί] εἰς xiv. 10 ἥλατο] ἐξήλλατο xv. 3 προπεμφθέντες] ἐκπεμφθέντες 16 κατεσκαμμένα] ἀνεσκαμμένα 30 ἐπέδωκαν] ἐπιδέδωκαν 32 ὄντες] ὑπάρχοντες xvi. 19 εἵλκυσαν] ἔσυραν 28 πράξῃς] ποιήσῃς 31 ἐπί] εἰς xvii. 1 διοδεύσαντες] διελθόντες 19 λαλουμένη] λεγομένη xviii. 18 προσμείνας] ἐπιμείνας 28 διακατηλέγχετο] κατηλέγχετο xix. 16 ἐπ' αὐτούς] ἐπ' αὐτοῖς 18 πεπιστευκότων] πιστευσάντων 19 κατέκαιον] κατέκαυσαν 26 μετέστησεν] ἀπέστησεν 33 δήμῳ] λαῷ 39 ἐπιζητεῖτε] ζητεῖτε xx. 18 εἰς] ἐπί xxi. 23 ὅ] ὅπερ 25 ἐθνῶν] ἀνθρώπων 27 συνέχεον] συνεκίνησαν 28 βοηθεῖτε] βοηθήσατε 38 ἀναστατώσας] ἐξαναστατώσας xxii. 5 ἄξων] ἄξαι 19 πιστεύοντας] πεπιστευκότας 21 ἔθνη] ἔθνος xxiii. 3 παρανομῶν] παρὰ τὸν νόμον 7 ἐσχίσθη] διεσχίσθη 24 διασώσωσιν] διασώσουσιν xxiv. 8 παρ' οὗ] παρ' ᾧ 10 ἐτῶν] ἐνιαυτῶν xxv. 7 καταφέροντες] ἐπιφέροντες 23 ἐλθόντος] εἰσελθόντος xxvi. 14 φωνὴν λέγουσαν] φωνῆς λεγούσης

These variations show some light-heartedness, if not downright carelessness, on the part of the writer. They are, however, so far as priority is concerned, as dust in the balance when compared with the array of Greek constructions preserved in 𝔏ᵉ. I therefore take the priority of *E* to 𝔏ᵉ as proved.

Before going further I offer a few remarks upon the Latinity of 𝔏ᵉ. The subject is too large for full treatment here.

The first and most obvious point is that, whereas *nomina sacra* are abbreviated

in *E*, as is usual in all Greek MSS., no such abbreviations occur in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, with one exception. The exception occurs in xiii. 21 (f. 111), where the writer, finding himself short of space, added in a smaller hand at the foot of the page:

testimonium perhibens	μαρτυρήσας
inueni	ηυρον
dād	δᾱδ
filium iesse	τον του ιεσσαι

Here the Greek compendium Δᾱδ has been taken over in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ from *E*. The absence of the ordinary compendia for *deus*, *dominus*, etc. seems to show that the scribe was not familiar with Latin practice.

$\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, like $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, teems with confusions of vowels and consonants. A peculiarity is the large number of words which have been clipped, e.g. iii. 22 pro[phe]tam (so 23), v. 15 uen[ien]te, vii. 6 re[digent], xii. 20 super cubi[culo], xvii. 20 atheni[enses], xviii. 18 to[nso], xx. 19 [om]ni (so 36), xxi. 12 audissi[mus], xxiv. 7 accusa[to]res, xxvi. 9 deu[er]e.

Latin words are frequently confused, e.g. vii. 59 *scriptum* = *spiritum*, xv. 9 *puerificans* = *purificans*, 25 *castis* = *constitutis*, xvi. 37 *caecos* = *caesos*, xviii. 7 *miserans* = *migrans*.

Some of the corruptions are curious, e.g. viii. 37 *suscepis* = *saluus eris* (σωθήσει *E*). This points to the clipped form *s[alu]us*, combined with a confusion of *r* with *p*, for which we may compare x. 22 *centypio* for *centurio*. Other cases are xv. 6 *hierede* = *uidere*, xvii. 20 *sinuas* = *aures*, xviii. 10 *porus* = *populus*, xix. 14 *quindam* = *cuiusdam*, 36 *propterque* = *proterue*. *Descendens* is frequently corrupted, e.g. viii. 5 *descens* (so x. 21), x. 11 *descedens* (so xii. 13), xx. 10 *descendes*.

Doublets are conflated, e.g. xvi. 32 *locutisuti sunt*, xxvi. 12 *in quibuibus*. In xxii. 11 we find *iab* (= *ab*) *eis qui mtecum erant*. Here the variants *mecum* and *tecum* have been combined. More interesting cases are:

xvi. 13 foras extra | εξω. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has *extra*.

xix. 20 potens fortiter | κατα κρατος. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has *potens*.

xxii. 26 qui[d] acturus es facere | τι μελλεις ποιειν. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has *quid facturus es* (*quid acturus es*, *vg.*).

A curious error characteristic of $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ is that the Greek past participle nom. is frequently translated by the Latin pluperfect subj. without *cum*, e.g.

viii. 14 audissent autem | ἀκούσαντες δέ, 18 uidisset autem | ἰδὼν δέ, xv. 4 conuenissent autem | παραγενόμενοι δέ.

Similar examples occur xvii. 32, xix. 35, xx. 5. We may compare xxv. 23 et introissent | και εισελθοντων.

The Greek middle seems to be responsible for the following translations:

iv. 13 comperti | καταλαβόμενοι (so xxv. 25), xvii. 5 adsumpti forensium uiros | προσλαβόμενοι τῶν ἀγοραίων ἄνδρας, xxvi. 26 conicior | πειθομαι.

A persistent error is the use of *principes* for *princeps*. Thus ἀρχιερεύς in the singular is rendered by *principes sacerdotum* with a singular verb in iv. 6, v. 27, vii. 1, xix. 14, xxii. 5, xxiii. 4, xxiv. 1. So in xviii. 17 ἀρχισυνάγωγος is translated by *principes synagogae*.

The following errors are curious:

v. 35 adtendite se ipsis | προσεχεται εαυτοις

xx. 24 nec habeo animam praetiosiorem me in ipso | ουδε εχω την ψυχην μου τιμιαν εμαυτω

28 adtendite ergo se ipsis | προσεχετε ουν εαυτοις

I proceed to consider differences between *E* and $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$. We have already seen in the case of *D* that $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ differs from it in a very large number of readings, the majority of which seem to be drawn from a Latin MS. resembling $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$. These readings are often conflated with a literal rendering of *D*, with the result, in many cases, of mere nonsense. As there is, without doubt, an intimate connexion between the language of $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, we should, if a text of the $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ type was used to help in the Latin column, expect to find a large number of divergences between $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ and *E*. It is, therefore, somewhat surprising to find that such phenomena are generally conspicuous by their absence. The explanation, of course, may be that the formation of *E* was not so favourable to the growth of such variants as that of *D*.

I do not think it necessary to dwell upon cases where the columns do not correspond, e.g. ii. 1:

id in ipsum	ομοθυμαδον
simul	επι το αυτο

or where one column, generally the Latin, gets out of step with the other. Such irregularities must occur in any bilingual MSS. Other trivial cases are:

(*a*) τε and δέ are frequently confused in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$.

(*b*) Small omissions, chiefly in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, e.g. ix. 31 πνεύματος, xxi. 34 δυναμένου, xxii. 7 διώκεις.

(*c*) An indicative is frequently substituted for a participle or vice versa in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, e.g.:

viii. 16 erat in quemquam eorum deciderat | ην επι ουδενι αυτων επιπεπτωκος.

(*d*) Graphical errors of *E* are not shared by $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ or vice versa. The most striking case is xx. 18

qui cum uenissent | ως δε εσκληρυνοντο

This error for παρέγενοντο can only be due to the fact that the writer looked back to xix. 9 ὡς δέ τινες ἐσκληρύνοντο. There is nothing in the formation of the MS. to explain this error. It may therefore be due to the pagination of an ancestor.

Attention has already been drawn (p. 239) to a block of cases in which $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ retains the reading of *cett.*, while *E* substitutes one synonym for another.

Apart from these I have noticed the following discrepancies:

i. 4 μετ' αὐτῶν (cum illis) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ (also $\mathfrak{L}^{gpt}$): αὐτοῖς *ACE*: *om.* ℵ *B* δ ii. 29 ἐξόν] + mihi $\mathfrak{L}^{de}$ iv. 28 βουλή σου] βουλή *AB*, $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$ v. 29 ἢ ἀνθρώποις] an hominibus $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ vii. 43 ἐπὶ μέρη *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: in partem $\mathfrak{L}^{ep}$: ἐπέκεινα *cett.* (*E*) ix. 8 οὐδέν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{e}$): οὐδένα $A^{2}C$ *E* δ x. 6 ᾧ *cett.* (*E*): cuius $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, so $\mathfrak{L}^{dgp}$ *vg.* 16 πάλιν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{egp}$, *alii*: εὐθύς Γ *E*, *alii* xiii. 31 οὗτος *D*

$\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: ὅς *cett.* (*E*) 46 παρρησιασάμενοί (-νός) τε *cett.* (*E*) : tunc constanter $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$, *vg.* xvi. 12 μερίδος *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{e}$) : μερίς *E* : *om. D* xvii. 25 προσδεόμενος] ὡς προσδ. ℵ, $\mathfrak{L}^{deg}$ 26 ἔθνος] γένος *c.Th.* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$ *vg.* xviii. 15 ζήτημα *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: ζητήματα *cett.* (*E*) xix. 9 τὴν ὁδόν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{e}$) : τὸν λόγον *E* 10 ἕως *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: ὥστε *cett.* (*E*) 15 τόν (*om.* Γ) Ἰησοῦν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{e}$) : τὸν μὲν Ἰησοῦν *BE* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ xxi. 36 κρᾶζον *D* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: κράζοντες *cett.* (*E*) xxii. 2 προσφωνεῖ *DE* : προσεφώνει *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{e}$) xxiii. 18 με *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{e}$) : *om. E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ xxv. 13 ἀσπασόμενοι 383, $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: ἀσπασάμενοι Γ *E* 614.

I now come to the most interesting part of this discussion, viz. passages where the Greek of *E* differs from that of *D* in important readings omitted by Γ. Ropes (pp. lxxxvi–vii) gives six instances (iii. 13, iv. 32, v. 15, vi. 10, xiii. 43, xiv. 7), with the remark, 'Where even the partly expurgated Latin version used for this codex had retained Western enlargements, it was necessary to translate these into Greek in order to equalize the columns'. Since on the same page he speaks of $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ as 'the foundation of the text', we should naturally expect these passages to be present in $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$. As a matter of fact, however, they are all absent from $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, except that in v. 15, and there the versions found in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ differ.

I now give a list of such passages, showing the agreement or disagreement of $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$:

ii. 14 πρῶτος *D* : prior $\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$: πρότερον (*post* αὐτοῦ) *E* : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

30 κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστῆσαι τὸν Χριστόν *D* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Orig.* : ἀναστῆσαι τὸν Χριστόν *E* : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$). The words form a στίχος in *D*.

iii. 13 εἰς κρίσιν (in iudicium) *D c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$: εἰς κριτήριον *E* : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

iv. 32 καὶ οὐκ ἦν διάκρισις ἐν αὐτοῖς οὐδεμία *D* (στ.), *Cypr. Ephr. alii* : καὶ οὐκ ἦν χωρισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς τις *E* : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

v. 12 ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ *D*, $\mathfrak{E}$: ἐν τῷ ναῷ συνηγμένοι *E*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

15 ἀπηλλάσσοντο γὰρ ἀπὸ πάσης ἀσθενείας ὡς (=ἧς) εἶχεν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: et liberantur ab infirmitate sua $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: καὶ ῥυσθῶσιν ἀπὸ πάσης ἀσθενείας ἧς εἶχον *E* (et liberarentur ab omni ualitudine quam habebant $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$)

38 μὴ μιάναντες τὰς χεῖρας *D* (στ.) : et non maculetis manus uestras $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: μὴ μολύνοντες τὰς χεῖρας ὑμῶν *E* : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

39 οὔτε ὑμεῖς οὔτε βασιλεῖς οὔτε τύραννοι· ἀπέχεσθε οὖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτων *D* (2 στ.), $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: οὔτε ὑμεῖς οὔτε οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *om. cett.*

vi. 8 διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *D* (στ.) : ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου (*om.* τοῦ κυρίου $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$) Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: *om. cett.*

10 διὰ τὸ ἐλέγχεσθαι αὐτοὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας *D* (2 στ.) *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{ht}$: διότι ἠλέγχοντο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μετὰ πάσ. παρρ. *E* : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

11 μὴ δυνάμενοι οὖν ἀντοφθαλμεῖν (resistere $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$) τῇ ἀληθείᾳ *D* (στ.) *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἐδύναντο ἀντιλέγειν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{t}$: *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

vii. 4 καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν *D* (στ.), $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: καὶ οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν *E*, *Aug.* : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

21 παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: εἰς τὸν ποταμόν *E* : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

viii. 24 τούτων τῶν κακῶν ὧν εἰρήκατέ μοι *D* : ὧν εἰρήκατε κακῶν *E* : ὧν εἰρήκατε *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

xiii. 8 ἐπειδὴ ἥδιστα ἤκουεν αὐτῶν *D* (στ.) 𝔖ph : ὅτι ἡδέως αὐτῶν ἤκουεν *E* : *om. cett.* (𝔏g)

43 ἐγένετο δὲ καθ' ὅλης τῆς πόλεως διελθεῖν τὸν λόγον *D* (2 στ.) *c.Th.* : ἐγένετο δὲ κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν φημισθῆναι τὸν λόγον *E* : *om. cett.* (𝔏g)

45 ἀντιλέγοντες καί *D* δ, 𝔖ph : ἐναντιούμενοι καί *E*, 𝔏g : *om. cett.*

xiv. 2 ὁ δὲ κύριος ἔδωκεν ταχὺ εἰρήνην *D* (στ.) *c.Th.*, 𝔏gp : ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἰρήνην ἐποίησεν *E* : *om. cett.*

7 καὶ ἐκινήθη ὅλον τὸ πλῆθος ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ *D* (στ.), 𝔏hp2 : καὶ ἐξεπλήσσετο πᾶσα ἡ πολυπληθία ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτῶν *E* : *om. cett.* (𝔏g)

xvii. 15 παρὰ Παύλου *D* : ἀπ' αὐτοῦ *E*, 𝔖vg, 𝔈 : *om. cett.* (𝔏g)

34 εὐσχήμων *D*, *Aug.* : τιμία *E* : *om. cett.* (𝔏g)

xx. 18 ὁμῶς ὄντων αὐτῶν *D*, 𝔏g : ὁμοθυμαδόν *E* : *om. cett.*

It will be seen that in sixteen out of the twenty-two cases mentioned above 𝔏g omits. In three out of the remaining six *E* differs from 𝔏g (v. 15, xiv. 2, xx. 18), in one an agreement between *E* and 𝔏g is shared by 𝔏h (vi. 8) and in two *E* and 𝔏g agree *sol.* (v. 39, xiii. 45).

The affinities of *E* in these passages appear to be not with 𝔏g, but with 𝔏h and 𝔏p, either alone or in combination. The agreements between *E* and 𝔏h are all the more remarkable, since only seven of the readings in question occur where 𝔏h is now extant (iii. 13 ; v. 38, 39 ; vi. 8, 10, 11 ; xiv. 7). We may safely infer that in a large proportion of the other cases 𝔏h contained a reading similar to that found in *E*.

If, therefore, these readings were retranslated from the Latin, as is most probable, their origin is to be sought not in 𝔏g, but in a MS. resembling 𝔏h (or in a less degree 𝔏p). If so, the problem with which we have to deal is more complicated than has been supposed.

I now come to *Z* readings in which the Greek of *E* does not differ, or differs very slightly, from that of *D*. I take first three important cases:

ii. 37 ὑποδείξατε ἡμῖν *D* (στ.) *c.Th.* *E*, 𝔏gpt : *om. cett.*

xiv. 7 ὁ δὲ Παῦλος καὶ Βαρνάβας διέτριβον ἐν Λύστροις *D* (2 στ.) *E*, 𝔏hp, *om. cett.* (𝔏g)

xv. 26 εἰς πάντα πειρασμόν *D* (στ.) *c.Th.* *E* δ : *om. cett.* (𝔏g)

It is hard to see how these passages could have been rendered differently. With them we may compare:

vi. 8 διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *D* (στ.), *alii*. *E* has ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κτλ. with 𝔏gh

Minor cases are:

iii. 8 χαιρόμενος *D* : χαίρων *E*, g[audens] 𝔏h : *om. cett.* (𝔏gp)

17 ἄνδρες *DE*, 𝔏hp : *om. cett.* (𝔏g)

iv. 1 τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα *D* *c.Th*, 𝔏h : ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα *E*, 𝔏gp, 𝔖vg : *om. cett.*

vi. 10 τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ *DE*, 𝔏h : *om. cett.* (𝔏gp)

ib. τῷ ἁγίῳ *DE*, 𝔏ghpt : *om. cett.*

vii. 1 τῷ Στεφάνῳ *DE*, 𝔏gp : τὸν Στέφανον 𝔏h : *om. cett.*

24 ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ (*om.* αὐτοῦ *D*) *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}$: *om. cett.*

x. 26 ὡς καί σύ *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gpt}$: *om. cett.*

29 ὑφ' ὑμῶν *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

xiii. 45 λόγοις *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.*

47 ἰδού *DE*, *Cypr.* : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

xiv. 1 πρὸς αὐτούς *DE*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

6 ὅλην *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ (?) : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

10 εὐθέως παραχρῆμα *D* (*cf. c.Th.*) : παραχρῆμα *E* : confestim $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ (?) : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

19 τινες *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

xvii. 20 ῥήματα *DE*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

xx. 32 ὑμᾶς *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: *om. cett.*

33 ὑμῶν *DE*, *spec.* : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

It will be noticed that wherever $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ is extant it agrees closely with *DE*. In xiii. 47 the evidence of Cyprian probably shows the agreement of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ with ἰδού.

It will be of interest to consider here *Z* readings which occur in *E* where *D* is not extant. The chief cases are :

viii. 37 εἶπεν δέ . . . Χριστόν *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gpt}$, $\mathfrak{S}$, *Cypr. Aug.* : *om. cett.*

ix. 4 σκληρόν . . . λακτίζειν *E*, $\mathfrak{S}$, *Aug. alii* : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

xxiv. 6–7 καὶ κατά . . . ἀπήγαγεν *E* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp^2}$, $\mathfrak{S}$: *om. cett.*

8 κελεύσας . . . πρός σε *E* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{p^2}$, $\mathfrak{S}$: *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

Minor cases are :

ix. 18 παραχρῆμα C^2E 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{hpt}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) 22 ἐν τῷ λόγῳ *CE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$: *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) 30 διὰ (*om.* 614) νυκτός *E* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: *om. cett.* 40 παραχρῆμα *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *spec.* : *om. cett.* xxiii. 30 κατηγόροις] + αὐτοῦ *E*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$ ib. ἔρρωσο ℵ *E* δ, $\mathfrak{S}$: *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

I now take agreements of *E* with Latin MSS. (1) The bulk of these are with $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$:

ii. 4 τὸ πνεῦμα] + τὸ ἅγιον *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.* v. 33 ἀκούσαντες] + ταῦτα *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.* vi. 8 τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα] σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}$ vii. 19 ζωογονεῖσθαι] + τὰ ἄρρενα *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ 32 ἐγώ] + εἰμι *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$ x. 31 σου ἡ προσευχή] ἡ προσευχή σου *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.* xii. 11 πάσης] ἐκ πάσης *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ xiii. 6 Βαριησοῦς] + ὁ μεθερμηνεύεται Ἐλύμας (elimas $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ 25 ἐγώ] + ὁ Χριστός *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ xiv. 25 τοῦ κυρίου] τοῦ θεοῦ *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ xv. 6 λόγου] ζητήματος *E* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ xix. 9 τὴν ὁδόν] + τοῦ κυρίου (θεοῦ) *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ xx. 3 μέλλοντι] μέλλων *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ 25 ἰδού *om.* *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ xxii. 29 Ῥωμαῖος] πολίτης Ῥωμαῖος *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.* xxv. 4 μέλλειν] *om.* *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ 15 μοι *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{E}$: *om. cett.* 17 ἀναβολὴν μηδεμίαν] μηδεμίαν ἀναβολήν *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*

(2) *E* agrees with $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$:

iii. 14 χαρισθῆναι] ζῆν καὶ χαρισθῆναι *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ iv. 10 Ἰησοῦ] τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ ib. ὑγιής] + καὶ ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενί *E*, *cf. c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Cypr.*

(3) *E* agrees with $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$:

iv. 17 τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, 𝔈, *cf. c.Th.* : *om. cett.* v. 23 τό] + μέν *E* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$ *vg.*, 𝔈 xxvi. 24 λαλοῦντος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπολογουμένου *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$ *vg.* : αὐτοῦ ἀπολ. *cett.*

(4) *E* agrees with $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$:

ii. 33 τοῦτο τὸ δῶρον *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, 𝔖, 𝔈 : τοῦτο *cett.* (*om. D*) iii. 3 παρ' αὐτῶν *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.* vii. 16 Ἀβραάμ] + ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ viii. 4 τὸν λόγον] + τοῦ θεοῦ *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ ix. 22 καὶ λέγων *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: *om. cett.*

(5) *E* agrees with $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$:

i. 15 ὀνομάτων] ἀνδρῶν *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ iv. 8 Ἰσραήλ] + ἀκούσατε *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp2}$ v. 35 ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις] ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτων *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ vii. 27 καὶ δικαστήν] ἢ δικαστήν *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ xii. 8 ζῶσαι] περιζῶσαι *E* 383, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ *vg.* xxv. 8 τοῦ Παύλου] τοῦ δὲ Παύλου *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

(6) *E* agrees with $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$:

ix. 22 ἐν τῷ λόγῳ *CE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$: *om. cett.*

I do not think it worth while to mention variants which are supported by δ, since they probably came into *E* from the Greek MS. which forms its basis.

E has some noteworthy agreements with $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$. A list of these will be found under $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$. I give here one instance :

v. 24 διηπόρουν] ἐθαύμαζον καὶ διηπόρουν *E*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

Here *E* and $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ appear to combine variants.

Similar conflations appear elsewhere in *E*, viz. :

vi. 8 χάριτος *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) : πίστεως 383, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: χάριτος καὶ πίστεως *E*

x. 23 τότε εἰσαγαγὼν *D* : εἰσκαλεσάμενος οὖν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) : τότε προσκαλεσάμενος *E*

xiv. 1 πιστεῦσαι (-εύειν *D*) *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) : θαυμάσαι . . . καὶ πιστεῦσαι *E*

xvii. 5 καὶ ὀχλοποιήσαντες *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) : ἀπειθήσαντες καὶ ὀχλοποιήσαντες *E*. Here ἀπειθήσαντες is a roving variant taken from the beginning of the verse, where *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ have ἀπειθοῦντες (ζηλώσαντες *cett.*). The variant is added in different places by δ and $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$.

To these may be added :

v. 12 ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ *D*, 𝔈 : συνήχθησαν $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ἐν τῷ ναῷ συνηγμένοι *E* : *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

ix. 13 ἀπεκρίθη δέ *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) : καὶ εἶπεν $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ἀπεκρίθη δὲ καὶ εἶπεν *E*, 𝔈

In the first of these passages *E* conflates a variant of $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ with the reading of *D* and 𝔈. In the second *E* with 𝔈 conflates a variant of $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ with the reading of *cett.*

There are other agreements of *E* and 𝔈, the most striking case being

v. 9 σου] + ἵστανται *E*, $\mathfrak{E}^{vt}$

In view of the affinity between Old-Latin MSS. and $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, 𝔈, it is probable that these and other variants have come into *E* from an O.-L. source.

I now come to what may be termed the original contributions of *E*. The most noticeable are small additions or expansions.

i. 23 καί] + τούτων λεχθέντων ii. 24 λύσας] + δι' αὐτοῦ 43 σημεῖα] + οὐ μικρά iv. 23 ἀπολυθέντες δέ] ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἀπολυθέντες v. 1 ἀνήρ δέ] ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ καιρῷ ἀνήρ 6 ἀναστάντες δέ] + παραχρῆμα 15 τιθέναι] + ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν 16 φέροντες] + μεθ' ἑαυτῶν 17 ἀναστάς δέ] καὶ ταῦτα βλέπων ἀναστάς 26 στρατηγός] + ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ 30 ἤγειρεν] + τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ vi. 12 συνεκίνησαν] καὶ ταῦτα εἰπόντες συνεκίνησαν vii. 7 ἐξελεύσονται] + ἐκεῖθεν 31 φωνή] + ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ xiii. 5 εἶχον δέ] ἔχοντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν 14 αὐτοὶ δέ] Παῦλος δὲ καὶ Βαρνάβας 26 θεόν] + ἀκούσατε xiv. 7 ἦσαν εὐαγγελιζόμενοι] + τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ xvi. 31 ὁ οἶκος] πᾶς ὁ οἶκος xviii. 28 δημοσίᾳ] + καὶ κατ' οἶκον

To these may be added cases where *E* is supported by some patristic evidence, viz.:

i. 7 καὶ εἶπεν *D*, 𝔏gpt: ὁ δὲ εἶπεν *C*, *Aug.*ab: εἶπεν δέ ℵ *A* δ: ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν *E*, *Aug.*c vii. 3 συγγενείας σου] + καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρός σου *E*, *Aug.* (*Civ. D.* xvi. 16) xiii. 46 στρεφόμεθα] + ἡμεῖς *E*, *Ambst.*

I regard all these as highly suspicious.

Other variants of *E* seem due to substitution, e.g.:

ii. 22 αὐτοί] ὑμεῖς πάντες iv. 19 εἰ δίκαιόν ἐστιν] εἰ τοῦτο ὑμῖν δίκαιον φαίνεται 21 διὰ τὸν λαόν] φοβούμενοι τὸν λαόν v. 16 συνήρχετο δέ] διὸ συνήρχετο καί

It is possible that these are retranslations into Greek from a somewhat loose version such as that found in 𝔏h (or 𝔖vg) and were introduced at the same time as the supplements from *Z* previously noticed.

A more plausible change is in xxvi. 18 ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν] ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθ. τῶν τυφλῶν, where τῶν τυφλῶν is given by *Aug. Trin.* xiii. 19.

I pass over various changes in the collocation, as due to carelessness.

I now proceed to sum up the results of this discussion. There can be no doubt that the basis of *E* is to be found in a Greek MS. of the kind current at the time, which did not possess the extra matter found in Z. This was collated with a version presumably Latin, and the extra matter added from this source. A MS. of the 𝔏h type may well have been the fount from which these additions were taken. They were translated into Greek which regularly differs from that of *D*. At a later date the text, thus amplified, was used as the Greek side of a bilingual MS. This was provided with a Latin translation. This translation is full of Graecisms and, with certain differences, agrees minutely with the Greek side in its peculiar readings. While, however, the Latin is clearly a rendering of the Greek, the language employed is curiously similar to that found in 𝔏g and the Vulgate. The relation of 𝔏e to 𝔏g and *vg.* forms an interesting problem which will be discussed later on (pp. 271 sqq.).

LATIN MSS.

(1) $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ (Floriacensis), sixth cent.

This palimpsest, which is one of the chief witnesses to the *Z* text, contains Acts iii. 2–iv. 18, v. 23–vii. 2, vii. 42–viii. 2, ix. 4–24, xiv. 5–23, xvii. 34–xviii. 19, xxiii. 8–24, xxvi. 20–32, xxvii. 1–12. The edges of the lines have been clipped throughout, and parts of the MS. are somewhat illegible, especially f. 117^{v}, which contains xiv. 5–23. The MS. has been twice collated, first by S. Berger and subsequently by E. S. Buchanan. There are grave differences between the two collations: thus in vii. 50 that of Berger omits *οὐχὶ ἡ χείρ μου ἐποίησεν πάντα ταῦτα*, and in xiv. 12 *ἐπειδὴ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ ἡγούμενος τοῦ λόγου*, while in that of Buchanan both passages are present. A list of the chief differences is given by Ropes (pp. cccxiv–xv). Recent writers, e.g. Hans von Soden and Zahn, accept Buchanan's corrections *en bloc*, a proceeding which seems to me rash, until the MS. has been examined by a third expert. My own eyes are not good enough for me to attempt the task.

It is usual to say that $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ gives us the text of Cyprian. Ropes says (p. cvii n. 2) that 'about 203 verses of Acts are extant in *h* and in these but 10 differences from the Cyprianic text of the *Testimonia* appear'. It might be inferred from this statement that a considerable number out of these 203 verses also appear in Cyprian's *Testimonia*. As a matter of fact the only passages quoted in the *Testimonia* which are extant in $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ are iii. 6 *dixit autem . . . elevavit eum* (*Test.* iii. 61) and iv. 8–12 *principes populi . . . salvari nos*. The second of these quotations is long and important, and in it, apart from some small differences, the text of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ is identical with that used by Cyprian.

Two short quotations occur in other works of Cyprian, viz.:

vi. 2 convocaverunt illi xii totam plebem discipulorum et dixerunt eis $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Cypr.* (*Ep.* 67. 4). Here the rendering *illi duodecim* (= *οἱ δώδεκα*) is peculiar to $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ and Cyprian, though it occurs frequently in *Old-Latin* MSS. of Evv.

vii. 60 Domine, ne statuas illis hoc peccatum $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Cypr.* (*De bono patientiae* 16). This passage proves nothing, since exactly the same rendering is found in $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ and *vg.*, as well as in $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, and the only variant in $\mathfrak{L}^{de}$ is *peccatum hoc.*

It appears therefore that the identification rests upon iii. 6 and iv. 8–12, chiefly the latter passage.

I now proceed to discuss the character of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$.

The first point to consider is its relation to its Greek original. There are two striking transliterations of Greek words, viz.: iii. 10 *horream* (= *ὡραίαν*) and xxvii. 8 *anchis* (= *ἐγγύς*). There are also some errors due to confusion of Greek words, the chief being vii. 45 *ἐξῶσεν*] *salvavit* (= *ἔσωσεν*) and xxvii. 13 *ἆσσον*] *celerius* (= *θᾶσσον*). In xiv. 18 *κατέπαυσαν* is rendered by [*persua*]-*serunt* (= *κατέπεισαν*), and in vii. 51 *ἀντιπίπτετε*] *contradixistis* there seems to be a confusion between *ἀντιπίπτετε* and *ἀντείπατε*. I have not observed any

Greek idioms such as are found in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, with the possible exception of xxvi. 31 *οὐδὲν θανάτου ἢ δεσμῶν ἄξιον*] *nihil mortem dignum vel vinculorum.*

The Latinity of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ will be discussed later on in connexion with that of other MSS. (see pp. 288–92). There is nothing peculiar about the *nomina sacra.* The *ds̄*, *dn̄s* types are used throughout.

The ignorance of the scribe may be illustrated by mistakes which he makes over the name *Paulus.* For this he gives *paus* in xviii. 18, *laulus* in xxiii. 20, *populus* in xiv. 9 (whether there is a similar error in xiv. 20 depends upon the supplement adopted).

There are cases where doublets seem to occur in the text. The clearest of these is iv. 5 *οἱ ἄρχοντες*] magistratus et prin[cipes] $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$. In iii. 4, *ἀτένισον D*: *βλέψον cett.*, Buchanan ascribes to $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *ad*[*spice dixit*] *et contemplare me*, which seems more probable than Berger's *ad*[*stans dixit*] *ei contemplare me.* In xxiii. 16 for *ὁ υἱός* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ gives *iuvenis filius*, which looks like a conflation of *νεανίας* and *υἱός.* In xiv. 6 Buchanan reports $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ as having [*fugerunt*] *in Lycaoniae civitates, sicut ih̄s dixerat eis LX*[. . . *in Lys*]*tra et Derben.* If this reading is correct (it does not appear in Berger's transcript), I can only regard the words *sicut . . . LX*[*XII*] as a note which has got into the text.[1]

The impression which $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ makes is that of a free translation with a tendency to explanation or periphrasis. I instance the following cases:

iv. 15 *αὐτούς cett.*: [Petru]m et Iohannem $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, vi. 1 *αὐτῶν*] Graecorum $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, viii. 1 *αὐτοῦ*] Stephani $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, xxiii. 8 *τὰ ἀμφότερα*] resurrectionem et ang[elum et] spiritum $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$.

The last case is of especial interest, since it is also found in the Sahidic. It is more natural to consider this an expansion of *τὰ ἀμφότερα* than *vice versa.*

The frequency with which *τότε* (*tunc*) is given by $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *sol.* suggests that the translator had a fondness for this word. Instances are vii. 42, xiv. 21, xviii. 5, 6, 9. With these we may compare other small insertions, e.g. iii. 12 *et dixit*, v. 36 *quidam*, 37 *deinde*, 40 *alicui*, vi. 3 *domini*, 15 *dei*, ix. 14 *in nos*, xviii. 14 *in eo*, xxvi. 31 *de eo.* Such expansions are probably mere Latinisms similar to the Syriacisms which are obelized in $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$.

In a number of cases the reading of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, if it stood alone, might be dismissed as merely due to expansion. There is, however, a very curious fact which requires to be taken into consideration, viz. that frequently the reading of $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ resembles that of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ (cf. pp. 301–4). It is therefore probable that both variants go back to a Greek source.

A peculiar feature of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ in the later chapters of Acts is the frequency with which it omits passages found in other MSS. In chs. i–xxiii there are not many cases which call for mention. The chief are:

ix. 10 (12) *καὶ εἶδεν ἄνδρα ἐν ὁράματι Ἀνανίαν ὀνόματι εἰσελθόντα καὶ ἐπιθέντα αὐτῷ χεῖρας ὅπως ἀναβλέψῃ om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ (cf. p. liii).

xvii. 34 *D* has ΤΙΝΕΣ ΔΕ ΑΝΔΡΕΣ ΕΚΟΛΛΗΘΗΣΑΝ
ΑΥΤΩ ΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΑΝ

[1] Ephrem remarks on xviii. 6 (*ἐκτιναξάμενος . . . τὰ ἱμάτια*) 'He shook out his garments as he had learned of his Lord'.

𝔏h renders *quidam autem crediderunt*. The omission suggests that an ancestor was written in στίχοι similar to those in *D*.

xviii. 5 συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ ὁ Παῦλος διαμαρτυρόμενος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν *om.* 𝔏h.

xxiii. 15 πρὸ τοῦ ἐγγίσαι αὐτόν *om.* 𝔏h.

I pass over some minor omissions of one or two words.

In chs. xxvi–xxvii we find a series of omissions, viz.:

xxvi. 22 ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης *om.* 𝔏h
23 εἰ πρῶτος *om.* 𝔏h
26 καὶ παρρησιαζόμενος *om.* 𝔏h
ib. οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἐν γωνίᾳ πεπραγμένον τοῦτο *om.* 𝔏h
30 ἥ τε Βερνίκη *om.* 𝔏h
xxvii. 1 σπείρης Σεβαστῆς *om.* 𝔏h
2 μέλλοντι πλεῖν εἰς τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν τόπους *om.* 𝔏h
7 μὴ προσεῶντος ἡμᾶς τοῦ ἀνέμου *om.* 𝔏h
ib. κατὰ Σαλμώνην *om.* 𝔏h, 614
8 τόπον τινὰ καλούμενον *om.* 𝔏h
10 τοῦ φορτίου καί *om.* 𝔏h
12 ἀνευθέτου δὲ τοῦ λιμένος ὑπάρχοντος πρὸς παραχειμασίαν οἱ πλείονες *om.* 𝔏h
ib. βλέποντα κατὰ λίβα καὶ κατὰ χῶρον *om.* 𝔏h (καὶ κατὰ χῶρον *om.* 𝔖vg)
13 δόξαντες τῆς προθέσεως κεκρατηκέναι *om.* 𝔏h

I pass over some minor cases. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that either the translator, or a subsequent scribe, became weary of his work and made cuts towards the end of his task.

In connexion with omissions I would mention two cases of transposition, viz. iv. 13, where *D* has:

οτι ανθρωποι αγραμματοι εισιν εθαυμαζον
επεγεινωσκον δε αυτους οτι συν τω ιη̅υ̅ ησα̅

𝔏h omits στ. 2 here and inserts it in *v*. 14 after

ουδεν ειχον ποιησαι η αντιπειν

where it is clearly out of place.

xiv. 8–9 *D* has:

ος ουδεποτε περειπεπατηκει
ουτος ηκουσεν του παυλου λαλουντος
υπαρχων εν φοβω

𝔏h puts στ. 3 after στ. 1, where it comes in very awkwardly. It is omitted by Γ, *cett.*

I abstain from discussing iv. 10–12 where *c.Th.* agrees with 𝔏h and Cyprian in placing the words ἐν ἄλλῳ δὲ οὐδενί in *v*. 10 after ὑγιής while *D*, *cett.* have καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενί in *v*. 12, since this involves controversial matter.

I now proceed to consider the relation of 𝔏h to *D* and *c.Th.* For this purpose it is not necessary to treat well-known *Z* readings where all three authorities agree against Γ, *cett.*

(*a*) I take first special agreements of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ with *D*.

iii. 3 οὗτος ἀτενίσας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* (στ.)
7 ἐστάθη καί *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.*
8 περιπατῶν καὶ ἁλλόμενος *om. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$
11 ἐκπορευομένου (-ων $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$) δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ Ἰωάννου (+καὶ αὐτός $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$) συνεξεπορεύετο κρατῶν αὐτούς *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: κρατοῦντος δὲ τὸν Π. καὶ τὸν Ἰ. *cett.*
iv. 14 ποιῆσαι ἤ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.*
vi. 1 ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ τῶν Ἑβραίων *D* : a ministris hebraecorum $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* (στ.)
5 τῶν μαθητῶν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.*
13 κατ' αὐτοῦ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.*
15 ἑστῶτος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{ht}$: *om. cett.* (στ.)
viii. 1 διωγμὸς μέγας καὶ θλῖψις *D* : θλῖψις καὶ διωγμὸς μέγας $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: διωγμὸς μέγας *cett.*
xiv. 9 ὑπάρχων ἐν φόβῳ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ (*alio loco*) : *om. cett.* (στ.)
20 πόλιν] Λύστραν πόλιν *D* : civitatem Lystram $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$. Here both *D* and $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ have the same conflation.
xviii. 4 εἰσπορευόμενος *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.*
ib. οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλά *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.*
7 ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀκύλα *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: ἐκεῖθεν *cett.*
8 διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *D* : in nomine iħu xp̄i $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: (*alio loco hab.* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$) : *om. cett.* (στ.)
12 συλλαλήσαντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* (from line to line, cf. p. xxv)
ib. ἐπὶ τῷ Παύλῳ *D* : de Paulo $\mathfrak{L}^{dh}$: τῷ Παύλῳ *cett.*
13 καταβοῶντες καί *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.*
16 ἀπήλασεν] ἀπέλυσεν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, agreeing in a *proprius error.*
17 τότε ὁ Γαλλίων προσεποιεῖτο μὴ ἰδεῖν $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ (*def. D*) $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, cf. *Ephrem* : καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων τῷ Γαλλίωνι ἔμελεν *cett.*

To these may be added cases where *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ are reinforced by *E*, as *E* adds nothing to their authority :

iii. 8 χαιρόμενος *D* : χαίρων *E* : g[audens] $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.*
v. 38 μὴ μιάναντες τὰς χεῖρας *DE* (*sim.*), $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* (στ.)
vi. 10 τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.*
xiv. 7 καὶ ἐκινήθη ὅλον τὸ πλῆθος ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ. ὁ δὲ Παῦλος καὶ Βαρνάβας διέτριβον ἐν Λύστροις *DE* (*sim.*), $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* (3 στ.)

Among minor agreements may be mentioned :

iii. 3 καὶ ἰδών *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: ὃς ἰδών *cett.* 12 ἡμῶν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Iren.* : *om. cett.* 13 Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν *D* : Ἰησοῦν . . . $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: Ἰησοῦν *cett.* 17 ὑμεῖς μέν *D* : [no]n quidem $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* 18 ὅ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: ἅ *cett.* 19 ἐπέλθωσιν *D* : superveniant $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: ἔλθωσιν (veniant) *cett.* iv. 12 οὐ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Cypr.* : οὐδέ *cett.* vii. 52 ἐκεῖνοι *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν *cett.* 54 ἀκούσαντες *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: ἀκούοντες *cett.* xiv. 19 τινες *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* xviii. 6 ὁ Παῦλος *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* 14 ἄνδρες *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ · *om. cett.*

(*b*) I take next passages where *D* is supported by other Latin evidence in addition to that of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$:

The chief passage is vi. 3, where *D* has:

τι ουν εστιν αδελφοι
επισκεψασθαι εξ υμων αυτων

So $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$: *ἐπισκέψασθε δὲ ἀδελφοί cett.*

Others are:

iii. 3 *αὐτούς D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$: *om. cett.* 4 *ἐμβλέψας D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp2}$: *ἀτενίσας cett.* 17 *ἄνδρες DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$: *om. cett.* 21 *ἀπ' αἰῶνος om. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{ghp}$, *Iren.* iv. 1 *αὐτοῖς om. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{ghp}$ v. 31 *ἐν αὐτῷ D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$: *om. cett.* 32 *πάντων D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$: *om. cett.* 37 *πάντες om. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{ghp}$ vi. 3 *αὐτῶν D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{ghp}$: *om. cett.* ib. *ἐσόμεθα . . . προσκαρτεροῦντες D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{ghp}$: *προσκαρτερήσομεν cett.* 10 *τῷ ἁγίῳ DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{ghp}$: *om. cett.* vii. 1 *τῷ Στεφάνῳ DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$: *om. cett.* xiv. 14 *Βαρνάβας καὶ Παῦλος D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *οἱ ἀπόστολοι Β. καὶ Π. cett.*

(*c*) I now take passages where $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ agrees with *c.Th.*, either *sol.*, or with other support, against *D*. The chief passages are:

iv. 10 *ὑγιής] + ἐν ἄλλῳ δὲ οὐδενί c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Cypr.*, cf. *E. D, cett.* have *καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενί* in *v.* 12.

xiv. 18 *θύειν αὐτοῖς] + ἀλλὰ πορεύεσθαι ἕκαστον εἰς τὰ ἴδια c.Th. C δ*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$

19 *καὶ διαλεγομένων αὐτῶν παρρησίᾳ ἔπεισαν τοὺς ὄχλους ἀποστῆναι ἀπ' αὐτῶν, λέγοντες ὅτι οὐδὲν ἀληθὲς λέγουσιν ἀλλὰ πάντα ψεύδονται c.Th. C c.Ath.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ (*fere*): *om. D, cett.*

xviii. 2 *οὗτοι δὲ ἐξήεσαν ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. D, cett.*

3 *ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἐγνώσθη τῷ Ἀκύλᾳ c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *spec.*: *om. D, cett.*

In the last four cases the additional matter comes at the end of a *στίχος* in *D*. The inference therefore is that *D* has omitted *στίχοι*.

Minor cases are:

iii. 6 *Πέτρος] + πρὸς αὐτόν* (ei $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Cypr.* iv. 17 *τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: *διὰ τὰ ῥήμ. ταῦτα c.Th.*: *om. D, cett.* xiv. 22 *λέγοντες c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ (?), $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.* xviii. 2 *καὶ Πρίσκιλλαν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ] σὺν Πρισκίλλῃ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{E}$.

(*d*) $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ = Latin MSS. against *D, cett.*

iii. 10 *καὶ ἐκστάσεως]* et stupebant $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$, $\mathfrak{E}$

ib. *ἐπλήσθησαν]* + omnes $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$

ib. *ἐπὶ τῷ γεγενημένῳ αὐτῷ] ἐφ' ᾧ αὐτῷ συμβέβηκεν ἴασις* $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$

12 *εὐσεβείᾳ] ἐξουσίᾳ* $\mathfrak{L}^{hp2}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

iv. 4 *ἀνδρῶν] αὐτῶν* $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$

v. 23 *ἔσω] om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$

29 *πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνθρώποις] τίνι πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ, θεῷ ἢ ἀνθρώποις; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, θεῷ*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$

40 *δείραντες . . . καὶ ἀπέλυσαν αὐτύος] δείραντες ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς* $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$

vii. 49 *λέγει κύριος] om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{ghp}$

54 *ταῖς καρδίαις] ἐν ταῖς καρδ.* $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$

xviii. 2 *ἠσπάσατο αὐτούς* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *καὶ ἠσπ. αὐτούς post προσῆλθεν αὐτοῖς* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *om. D cett.*

The most important of these passages is v. 29, where the reading of $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$ is sufficiently vindicated by its vigour. In xviii. 2 the additional words, as placed in $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, come at the end of a στίχος in *D*.

(*e*) Although $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ has not suffered interpolation from Γ to the same extent as *D*, there are several cases in which this appears to have taken place. The clearest example is iv. 6:

Ἰωνάθας *D*: Ἰωάθας $\mathfrak{L}^{dp2}$: Ἰωνάθαν $\mathfrak{L}^{gp1}$: Ἰωάννης *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$)

Others are:

iii. 11 θαμβηθέντες *D* (+ἔκθαμβοι *in fine versus ex* Γ), cf. $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ἔκθαμβοι (*in fine vers.*) *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$)
12 πρὸς αὐτούς *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: πρὸς τὸν λαόν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$)
14 ἐβαρύνατε *D*, *Iren.*, cf. *Aug.*: ἠρνήσασθε *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$)
vi. 6 οὗτοι ἐστάθησαν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: οὓς ἔστησαν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$)
vii. 43 ἐπὶ τὰ μέρη *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$: ἐπέκεινα *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$)
xiv. 13 ἱερεῖς *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Ephr.*: ἱερεύς *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$)
xvii. 34 εὐσχήμων *D*, *Aug.*: τιμία *E*: *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$)
xviii. 15 ἔχετε *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Ephr.*: ἐστιν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$)

So far I have confined myself to those portions of Acts in which *D* is extant. Where *D* fails, the affinities of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ are chiefly with *c.Th.* and δ (especially 614), and with other Latin MSS.

The chief agreements of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ with *c.Th.* (xxiii. 15, 23–4, xxvii. 1) have already been quoted (p. 230), and it is unnecessary to repeat them here. The most important passage is xxiii. 23–4, where the evidence of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ enables us to reconstitute the reading of *c.Th.*, which is given incorrectly in the Oxford MS. used by White.

There are various agreements of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ with δ, or 614, the chief of which are:

xxvi. 30 καὶ ταῦτα εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: *om. cett.*
xxvii. 5 δι' ἡμερῶν δεκαπέντε 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: *om. cett.*
Μύρα δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}$: Μύρρα *B*: Λύστραν *cett.*
7 κατὰ Σαλμώνην *om.* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$

For agreements of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ with other Latin MSS. the most striking passage is ix. 3–8, where we find a series of passages, omitted by Γ, which depend mainly on Latin evidence. Other agreements in the same chapter are:

ix. 11 Ταρσέα] τῷ γένει Ταρσέα $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$
προσεύχεται] + αὐτός $\mathfrak{L}^{ghp}$
13 ἤκουσα] + ἐγώ $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$
20 εἰσελθών $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$, *spec.*: *om. cett.*
τῶν Ἰουδαίων $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *spec.*: *om. cett.*
21 καὶ ὧδε] et huc quoque $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: et nunc quoque $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$
22 Χριστός] + ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεός $\mathfrak{L}^{ghp}$

The last case is especially noteworthy.

It is unnecessary to add here examples from the later chapters. Perhaps the most striking case is:

xxvi. 22 γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν Μωσῇ 𝕷^{gh}, *Tert. Ambst.*: καὶ Μωσῆς *cett.*

I now come to special readings of 𝕷^{h}.

(*a*) Additional passages:

i v. 3 ἐπιβαλόντες τὰς χεῖρας] + ἐκράτησαν αὐτούς 𝕷^{h}
38 καταλυθήσεται] + ἡ δύναμις αὐτῆς 𝕷^{h}
ix. 8 καὶ ἐγειράντων αὐτόν 𝕷^{h}, *Ephr.*: *om. cett.*
17 χεῖρας] + ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ 𝕷^{h}
20 μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας 𝕷^{h}, *Iren.*, *spec.*: *om. cett.* (*def. D*)
xiv. 20 ἑσπέρας γενομένης 𝕷^{h}, 𝕰, *Ephr.*: *om. cett.* (*D*)

Except in ix. 8, 17 and 20, where *D* is not extant, the additional matter comes in at the end of a στ. in *D*. The addition in ix. 17 would without doubt occupy a στ. in *D*. The most significant of these passages is iv. 3. Cf. p. xxxv.

Among minor additions the only cases which deserve notice are:

iii. 15 ζωῆς] + κρεμάσαντες 𝕷^{h}, *Vigil.*
v. 41 ἀπόστολοι] + ἀπολυθέντες 𝕷^{h}
xiv. 9 οὗτος] + ἡδέως 𝕷^{h}
19 παρρησίᾳ] + τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ 𝕷^{h}

Some small expansions have already been noticed (p. 248).

(*b*) Variants.

The most striking case is xiv. 19, in a passage where we are dependent upon *c.Th. C c. Ath.* Here, in place of ἀποστῆναι ἀπ' αὐτῶν, 𝕷^{h} has μὴ πιστεύειν αὐτοῖς διδάσκουσιν. This reading is very plausible, though the weight of testimony is against it.

In xviii. 5, where 𝕷^{h} omits συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ . . . Ἰησοῦν and begins the next sentence with *atque iterum*, it appears to have been botched after an omission.

In a number of cases it is difficult to decide whether the reading of 𝕷^{h} represents a genuine variant, or is simply due to free translation. I instance the following:

iv. 7 ἐποιήσατε τοῦτο ὑμεῖς] id fecissent 𝕷^{h}
v. 38 ἐὰν ᾖ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἡ βουλὴ αὕτη] si haec potestas humani (= -ae) voluntatis est 𝕷^{h}: ἐὰν αὕτη ἡ ἐξουσία ἀνθρωπίνου θελήματος ᾖ *Bl.*
vi. 1 πληθυνόντων τῶν μαθητῶν] cum abundaret turba di[scentium] 𝕷^{h}: πληθύνοντος τοῦ ὄχλου τῶν μαθ. *Bl.*
9 καὶ Κυρηναίων καὶ Ἀλεξανδρέων καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας] et alii Cyrenaei et ab Alexan[dria e]t Cilicia 𝕷^{h}
vii. 55 ὑπάρχων δὲ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου] [ipse aut]em cum esset in spiritu sancto 𝕷^{h}: ὁ δὲ ὑπάρχων ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ *Bl.*
ix. 19 ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἐν Δαμασκῷ μαθητῶν ἡμέρας τινάς] dies autem plurimos et in civitate Damas[co cum] discentibus transegit 𝕷^{h}: ἡμέρας δὲ πλείους καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει [Δαμασκῷ] μαθητῶν ἐγένετο *Bl.*

xiv. 8 *καί τις ἀνὴρ ἐκάθητο ἀδύνατος τοῖς ποσίν*] illic fuit quidam infirmus sedens languid[us pedibus] 𝔏[h] : *καὶ [ἐκεῖ] ἦν τις ἀσθενὴς καθήμενος ἀδύνατος τοῖς ποσίν Bl.*

18 *τοὺς ὄχλους τοῦ μὴ θύειν αὐτοῖς*] ne immolarent sibi illi homines 𝔏[h]: *τοῦ μὴ θύειν αὐτοῖς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους Bl.*

xxiii. 13 *οἱ ταύτην τὴν συνωμοσίαν ποιησάμενοι*] qui se devoverant 𝔏[h] : *οἱ ἑαυτοὺς ἀναθεματίσαντες Bl.*

19 *τί ἐστιν ὃ ἔχεις ἀπαγγεῖλαί μοι ;*] quid [esset q]uod haberet illi dicere 𝔏[h] : *τί εἴη ὃ ἔχοι αὐτῷ ἀπαγγεῖλαι Bl.*

xxvi. 29 *ὁ δὲ Παῦλος*] ad quem sic ait 𝔏[h] : *πρὸς ὃν οὕτως εἶπεν Bl.*

ib. *τοὺς ἀκούοντάς μου*] istos qui me audiunt 𝔏[h] : *τούτους τοὺς ἀκούοντάς μου Bl.*

xxvii. 3 *ἐπέτρεψεν πρὸς τοὺς φίλους πορευθέντι ἐπιμελείας τυχεῖν*] permisit amicis qui veniebant [ad eum] uti curam eius agerent 𝔏[h] : *ἐπέτρεψεν τοῖς φίλοις τοῖς ἐρχομένοις πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπιμέλειαν αὐτοῦ ποιήσασθαι Bl.*

In addition to other readings of this kind, there are a number of cases in which the collocation of words differs slightly from that of *cett.* Their insignificance may be seen from the fact that Blass hardly ever admits them to his text. A curious exception which I have noticed is iii. 24 *τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας*] [*is*]*tos dies* 𝔏[h]: *ταύτας τὰς ἡμέρας Bl.* I submit that such evidence is worthless, when drawn from a free translation such as 𝔏[h].

I conclude with a few remarks about the diffusion of 𝔏[h] and the Greek text which it represents. It is usual to call 𝔏[h] 'African'. If this means that it was used in Africa—as Cyprian's quotations of iii. 6–7 and iv. 10 seem to prove—as well as, very possibly, in other countries, I have nothing to say. If, however, it is intended to restrict its use to Africa, I must state that I know no valid reasons for such a conclusion. The linguistic evidence which is commonly adduced appears to me valueless. What is clear is that the Greek text on which 𝔏[h] is based was widely circulated in the East at an early date. This is shown by the numerous agreements between 𝔏[h] and the quotations of Ephrem, the Peshitto and the Sahidic version, which will be discussed later on. The chief evidence comes from the Peshitto, which agrees with 𝔏[h] (also with 𝔏[g]) in a large number of minute points.

De rebaptismate (reb.)

In connexion with 𝔏[h] it is usual to take the pseudo-Cyprianic work *De rebaptismate*, which Hans von Soden joins with 𝔏[h] and Cyprian as one of the witnesses for the supposed African text of Acts. Burkitt speaks of it as 'a very remarkable type—a third-century African text so far as regards renderings, but without the "Western" glosses' and says that 'it reflects the isolated position of the writer, who, although a contemporary of Cyprian, differed from the majority of the Africans in the biblical text he used'.[1] If this is so, it seems odd that von Soden should include it in the list of his witnesses to his 'African text'.

[1] *Encycl. Bibl.*, col. 4996.

I do not think it necessary to say more of *reb.* than that in the only passage where we have also the evidence of 𝔏^{h} and Cyprian, viz. iv. 12, it gives:

nec enim aliud est nomen sub caelo quod datum est hominibus, in quo oportet salvos fieri nos

𝔏^{h}, Cyprian have:

non est enim nomen aliud sub caelo datum hominibus in quo oportet salvari nos

Here there are a number of differences between 𝔏^{h}, *Cypr.* and *reb.* To this may be added viii. 20, where *reb.* has:

pecunia tua tecum sit in perditionem quia gratiam dei existimasti per pecunias posse possideri.

Cyprian quotes:

pecunia tua tecum sit in perditione quia existimasti gratiam dei per pecuniam possideri.

The text of *reb.* is generally that of Γ. Sporadic *Z* readings are: ii. 16 *om.* Ἰωήλ (=*D, Iren. Ephr., alii*) 17 *αὐτῶν . . . αὐτῶν* (= *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *Tert.*) 18 *om.* *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις* (= *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *Tert.*) xi. 17 *om.* *ὁ θεός* (= *D*, 𝔖^{ph}, *Aug.*).

(2) Aug.$^{\text{ab(c)}}$

Augustine on three occasions quotes long passages from Acts i–ii., viz. :

(1) Ep. Fundamenti 9 (*Aug.*$^{\text{a}}$).

(2) Contra Felicem Manichaeum i. 4–5 (*Aug.*$^{\text{b}}$).

(3) Ep. Catholica 27 (*Aug.*$^{\text{c}}$).

The most important of these is *Aug.*$^{\text{b}}$, since it is here expressly stated that the extracts were taken from a MS. We are told in § 3 that Augustine first read a lesson from the Gospels, Lk. xxiv. 36–49 (*et cum accepisset codicem evangelii recitavit*). After this *cum reddidisset codicem evangelii accepit actus apostolorum*. He then read aloud Acts, chs. i. 1–ii. 11.

No such statement is made about *Aug.*$^{\text{a}}$, but, as the text there given is substantially the same, though differing in certain particulars, it is inferred that it is taken from the same source. *Aug.*$^{\text{a}}$ contains Acts, chs. i. 1–8, ii. 1–13, omitting i. 9–26.

As *Aug.*$^{\text{a}}$ contains considerably less than *Aug.*$^{\text{b}}$ and is not attested by any mention of a codex, it is unfortunate that the symbols *Aug.*$^{\text{a}}$ and *Aug.*$^{\text{b}}$ were not reversed. In view, however, of the confusion which would result if any change were made, I have retained the usual nomenclature.

I now come to *Aug.*$^{\text{c}}$, which is in a different position. This, though founded upon *Aug.*$^{\text{ab}}$ and retaining a number of important *Z* readings, has been revised from another source, probably from Jerome's Vulgate. It therefore adds nothing to the authority of *Aug.*$^{\text{ab}}$, and I only include its readings here for the sake of completeness. *Aug.*$^{\text{c}}$ contains chs. i. 1–15 and ii. 1–41.

In the tabulations which follow it must be borne in mind that *Aug.*$^{\text{a}}$ fails in i. 9–26 and ends at ii. 13, *Aug.*$^{\text{b}}$ ends at ii. 11, *Aug.*$^{\text{c}}$ omits i. 16–26 (its readings will not be quoted after ii. 13, where *Aug.*$^{\text{a}}$ ends).

I now proceed to analyse the readings of *Aug.*$^{\text{ab(c)}}$:

(*a*) Agreements with *D* + *alii* :

i. 2 καὶ ἐκέλευσεν *D c.Th. alii*, *Aug.*$^{\text{abc}}$: *om. cett.*

ib. κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον *D c.Th.*, 𝔏$^{\text{gt}}$ *alii*, *Aug.*$^{\text{abc}}$: *om. cett.*

4 φησίν, διὰ τοῦ στόματος *D*, *vg.*, *Aug.*$^{\text{abc}}$: *om. cett.*

5 ὃ καὶ μέλλετε λαμβάνειν *D*, 𝔏$^{\text{gt}}$ *alii*, *Aug.*$^{\text{abc}}$: *om. cett.*

ib. ἕως τῆς πεντηκοστῆς *D*, 𝔈, *Ephr. Aug.*$^{\text{ab}}$: *om. cett.* (*Aug.*$^{\text{c}}$)

9 βλεπόντων αὐτῶν *cett.* (*Aug.*$^{\text{c}}$) : *om. D*, 𝔈, *Aug.*$^{\text{b}}$

ib. νεφέλη ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπήρθη *D*, 𝔖$^{\text{vg}}$, 𝔈, *Aug.*$^{\text{b}}$: ἐπήρθη καὶ νεφ. ὑπέλ. αὐτόν *cett.* (*Aug.*$^{\text{c}}$)

10 ἐσθῆτι λευκῇ *DE* δ, 𝔖$^{\text{ph}}$, *Aug.*$^{\text{bc}}$: ἐσθήσεσι λευκαῖς *cett.*

15 μαθητῶν *D alii*, *Cypr.*, *Aug.*$^{\text{bc}}$: ἀδελφῶν Γ, *vg.*, 𝔈

16 δεῖ *D*, 𝔏$^{\text{gpt}}$, *Aug.*$^{\text{b}}$: ἔδει *cett.*

17 ὃς *D*, *Aug.*$^{\text{b}}$: καί *cett.*

18 ἀδικίας αὐτοῦ *D*, 𝔏$^{\text{t}}$, 𝔖$^{\text{ph}}$, *Aug.*$^{\text{b}}$: ἀδικίας *cett.*

19 ὅ καί *D*, *Aug.*^{ab} : καὶ ὅ ℵ : καί *cett.*
21 Χριστός *D*, 𝔖^{ph}, *Aug.*^{b} : *om. cett.*
23 ἔστησεν *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *Aug.*^{b} : ἔστησαν *cett.*
24–5 ἕνα λαβεῖν *cett.*: ἀναλαβεῖν *D*, *Aug.*^{b}
25 δώδεκα *D*, 𝔖^{ph} : δωδέκατος *Cass.* : ἕνδεκα δωδέκατος *Aug.*^{b} : ἕνδεκα *cett.*
ii. 1 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις *D*: in temporibus illis 𝔏^{t} : in illo tempore *Aug.*^{a} : tempore *Aug.*^{b} : *om. cett.* (*Aug.*^{c})
τοῦ συμπληροῦσθαι *D*, *Aug.*^{ab} : καὶ ἐν τῷ συμπ. *cett.* (*Aug.*^{c})
5 ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἦσαν *D*, *Aug.*^{ab} : ἦσαν δὲ ἐν Ἱερ. *cett.* (*Aug.*^{c})
7 πρὸς ἀλλήλους *D alii*, *Aug.*^{abc} : *om.* Γ *alii*
8 τὴν (+ἰδίαν 𝔏^{g}, *Aug.*^{c}) διάλεκτον *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *Aug.*^{abc} : τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ *cett.*
12 ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι *D c.Th.*, *Aug.*^{ac} : *om. cett.*
13 διεχλεύαζον λέγοντες *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug.*^{ac}: διαχλευάζοντες (*sim.*) ἔλεγον *cett.*
οὗτοι (*non eodem loco*) *D*, 𝔏^{t} *vg.*, *Aug.*^{ac} : *om. cett.*

The most remarkable of these agreements is the *proprius error* ἀναλαβεῖν for ἕνα λαβεῖν in i. 24–5, which appears to show direct contact between *D* and *Aug.*^{b}. In connexion with this we may take a very significant passage in i. 3 where *D* has:

μετα το παθειν αυτον εν πολλοις τεκμηριοις
τεσσερακοντα ημερων

In στ. 2 δι', which D^{1} appears to have omitted by accident before ἡμερῶν, is added by a contemporary corrector (Scrivener's *A*). It is also omitted by *Aug.*^{b} (not by *Aug.*^{ac}). Also, after τεκμηρίοις (argumentis) *Aug.*^{ab} (not *Aug.*^{c}) add *dierum*, i.e. ἡμερῶν. This is due to looking forward to στ. 2, and seems to show that *Aug.*^{ab} are derived from an ancestor written in στίχοι resembling those in *D*.

In this list I have not included some trivial points where *Aug.*^{ab} agree with most authorities against members of Γ, e.g.:

i. 13 ἀνέβησαν (collocation), 14 καὶ τοῖς, 16 ταύτην, 25 τόπον, 26 αὐτῶν.

(*b*) Agreements with Γ, *alii* against *D*:

i. 11 εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν *cett.*, *Aug.*^{bc} : *om.* *D* (at end of στ.)
14 γυναιξὶν *cett.*, *Aug.*^{bc} : + καὶ τέκνοις *D*
15 ἐν δέ *D c.Th. E*, *Aug.*^{c} : ἐν 𝔏^{dpt} *vg.* : καὶ ἐν *cett.*, *Aug.*^{b}
21 ᾧ (ἐν ᾧ) *cett.*, *Aug.*^{b} : ὡς *D*
23 Βαρσαββᾶν *cett.*, *Aug.*^{b} : Βαρνάβαν *D*, 𝔏^{gpt} *alii*
ii. 1 ὄντων αὐτῶν πάντων *D*, 𝔖^{vg} : ἦσαν πάντες (*om.* πάντες ℵ) Γ, 𝔏^{d}, *Aug.*^{bc} : ἦσαν πάντες (*om.* πάντες *E*) ὁμοθυμαδόν (+ὁμοῦ *Aug.*^{a} *prom.*) *E* 383, *Aug.*^{a}
2 ἰδού *D*, *Cyril.* : *om. cett.* (𝔏^{d}), *Cypr.*, *Aug.*^{abc}
ib. πάντα *D*, 𝔏^{ep} : ὅλον *cett.*, *Aug.*^{abc}

I have not included in this list some cases where *Aug.*^{ab} agree with some members of Γ against *D* + other members of Γ, e.g.:

i. 8 ἐν πάσῃ ii. 3 ἐκάθισεν ii. 6 ἤκουεν (-ουσεν)

(*c*) Sporadic agreements with minor authorities :

i. 10 *καὶ ἰδού*] *ἰδού* 𝔏^{gt} *vg.*, *Aug.*^{bc}

ib. *ἄνδρες δύο*] *δύο ἄνδρες* 614, 𝔏^{gt}, *Aug.*^{bc} *prom.*

14 *οὗτοι πάντες ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες*] *καὶ ἦσαν προσκαρτ. πάντες* *Cypr. Aug.*^{b}

15 *ὀνομάτων*] *ἀνδρῶν* *E*, 𝔏^{gpt} *vg.*, *Aug.*^{bc}

ii. 4 *ἀποφθέγγεσθαι αὐτοῖς cett.*, *Aug.*^{c} : *αὐτοῖς ἀποφθ. E* δ, 𝔖, *Aug.*^{ab} *prom.*

7 *ἰδού*] *om.* 𝔏^{t}, *vg.*^{a}, 𝔈, *Aug.*^{abc}

ib. *εἰσιν οἱ λαλοῦντες Γαλιλαῖοι* (*sim.*) *cett.* : *οἱ λαλ. γένει εἰσιν Γαλ.* *Aug.*^{ab} *prom.*

8 *ἡμῶν*] *om.* *Aug.*^{abc} *prom.*

(*d*) Original contributions of *Aug.*^{ab} or of one of them.

i. 2 *ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ* *Aug.*^{ab} *Vig.* : *ἄχρις ἧς ἡμέρας cett.*, *Aug.*^{c}

ib. *τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐξελέξατο διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου*, *Aug.*^{abc} *Vig.* : *variant cett.*

3 *οἷς καί cett.*, *Aug.*^{c} : *οἷς* *Aug.*^{ab}

τεκμηρίοις cett., *Aug.*^{c} : + *ἡμερῶν* *Aug.*^{ab}

4 *καί*] *ὡς* *Aug.*^{a} : *ὡς καί* *Aug.*^{bc}

6 *ἀποκαθιστάνεις cett.*, *Aug.*^{bc} : + *καὶ πότε* *Aug.*^{a}

7 *πρὸς αὐτούς cett.* *Aug.*^{c} : *om.* *Aug.*^{ab}

8 *ἐπελθόντος*] *ἐπέλθουσαν* *Aug.*^{abc} (+ 𝔏^{t})

9 *καὶ ταῦτα*] *ταῦτα* *Aug.*^{bc}

ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν] *ἀπ' αὐτῶν* 𝔈, *Aug.*^{b}

11 *εἶπαν*] + *πρὸς αὐτούς* *Aug.*^{b}

14 *τῇ προσευχῇ cett.*, *Aug.*^{c} : *ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς* *Aug.*^{b}

18 *καὶ τὸν τράχηλον κατέδησεν αὐτοῦ* *Aug.*^{b} : *om. cett.* (*Aug.*^{c})

24 *προσευξάμενοι εἶπαν*] *προσευξάμενος εἶπεν* *Aug.*^{b}

ii. 4 *ἑτέραις* (*variis*) *cett.*, *Aug.*^{bc} : *om.* *Aug.*^{a}

5 *εὐλαβεῖς cett.*, *Aug.*^{c} : *om.* *Aug.*^{ab}

6 *ταύτης cett.*, *Aug.*^{c} : *om.* *Aug.*^{ab}

7 *οὗτοι cett.*, *Aug.*^{c} : *om.* *Aug.*^{ab}

8 *ἀκούομεν ἕκαστος cett.*, *Aug.*^{c} : agnoscimus in illis (*ἐπιγινώσκομεν ἐν αὐτοῖς Bl.*) *Aug.*^{ab} *prom.*

9 *'Ιουδαίαν cett.*, *Aug.*^{b} : *'Ιουδαῖοι* 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug.*^{c} : *'Αρμενίαν* *Tert.* *Aug.*^{a}

10 *'Ιουδαῖοί τε καὶ προσήλυτοι cett.*, *Aug.*^{bc}

11 *ἀκούομεν* (*sim.*) *cett.* : *ἤκουον* *Aug.*^{abc}

12 *ἄλλος πρὸς ἄλλον cett.*, *Aug.*^{c} : *om.* *Aug.*^{a}

I have not included in this list certain cases where readings of *Aug.*^{ab} seem to be Latinisms. A striking example is i. 7 *οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστίν*, which is rendered by *nemo potest* in *Aug.*^{ab} (so Cyprian). It was pointed out to him by Hesychius (*Aug. Ep.* 198 § 2) that the reading *in antiquissimis libris ecclesiarum* was *non est vestrum*, a more exact translation, which Augustine accepted in *Ep.* 199 § 4 (so *Aug.*^{c}). No such variant as *οὐδεὶς δύναται* (*Bl.*), appears in any Greek MS. So in i. 14 *Μαρίᾳ τῇ μητρὶ* is rendered *Maria quae fuerat* (*sim.*) *mater* by *Aug.*^{b} with Cyprian and 𝔏^{gp1}. I should attribute little importance to such renderings as i. 23 *ὃς ἐπεκλήθη 'Ιοῦστος*] *qui et Iustus Aug.*^{b}, and feel some doubt about ii. 8 *ἀκούομεν ἕκαστος*] *agnoscimus in illis Aug.*^{ab} *prom.* It is apparent from i. 3,

where ὀπτανόμενος αὐτοῖς is placed before τεσσεράκοντα by *Aug.*^{ab}, that he varied the order of the Greek: so other transpositions, e.g. i. 3 ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι] μὴ χωρ. ἀπὸ Ἱερ. *Aug.*^{ab} may be regarded with suspicion.

An inspection of the lists given above shows a considerable number of differences between *Aug.*^{a} and *Aug.*^{b} where they are both extant. The most important case is ii. 8 Ἰουδαίαν *Aug.*^{b}: Ἀρμενίαν *Aug.*^{a}, where the reading of *Aug.*^{a} (*Tert.*) seems to be an ancient conjecture. In i. 6 the addition of καὶ πότε (*et quando*) in *Aug.*^{a}, which is not shared by *Aug.*^{b}, does not look like a conjecture. I pass over minor points such as ii. 4 ἑτέραις *Aug.*^{b}: *om. Aug.*^{a}, since they may be due to accident.

On the other hand the substantial identity of *Aug.*^{ab} is undeniable. This is sufficiently proved by the addition of ἡμερῶν after τεκμηρίοις (i. 3) in both of them, quite apart from their constant agreement in striking readings. It is, however, possible that they were *gemelli*, a solution to which on the whole I incline.

I now proceed to consider the affinities of *Aug.*^{ab}.

(1) The connexion between *Aug.*^{ab} and Cyprian's text was pointed out by Corssen.[1] Ropes says that the text of *Aug.*^{ab} is 'almost identical with that of Cyprian's *Testimonia*'. This statement is founded upon two quotations, viz.:

i. 7 nemo potest cognoscere tempus aut tempora quae pater posuit in sua potestate, *Cypr.* (*Test.* iii. 89).

Aug.^{ab} agree verbally except that they omit *aut tempora* (= ἢ καιρούς). The special agreement of *Aug.*^{ab} with Cyprian's *nemo potest* has been already noted.

ii. 2 et factus est subito de caelo sonus quasi ferretur flatus vehemens et implevit totum locum in quo erant sedentes 3 Et visae sunt illis linguae divisae quasi ignis qui et insedit in unum quemque illorum 4 et impleti omnes spiritu sancto, *Cypr.* (*Test.* iii. 101).

Here there are a few variants, viz. in *v.* 2 *Aug.*^{a} places *illum* before *locum*, while *Aug.*^{b} has *totam illam domum* (with consequential *in qua*). In *v.* 3 *Aug.*^{ab} have *super unum* for *in unum*, and for *illorum* (*Aug.*^{a}) *Aug.*^{b} has *eorum*. Otherwise the agreement is exact, while $\mathfrak{L}^{egp}$, *vg.* differ widely.

In two other passages, not in the Testimonia, we have the evidence of *Aug.*^{b} only (*def. Aug.*^{a}), viz.:

i. 14 et erant perseverantes omnes unanimes in oratione cum mulieribus et Maria quae fuerat mater Iesu et fratribus eius. *Cypr.* (*De unit.* 25, *De domin. orat.* 8). For *oratione Aug.*^{b} has *orationibus*.

15 surrexit Petrus in medio discentium. Fuit autem turba in uno *Cypr.* (*Ep.* 67, 4). *Aug.*^{b} has *exsurrexit*, and adds *et dixit*, which Cyprian omits, before *fuit*.

These passages are sufficient to show great similarity between *Aug.*^{ab} and the text used by Cyprian.

It has already been shown in the chapter upon $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ that its text in iii. 6 and iv. 8–12 agrees notably with quotations in Cyprian's *Testimonia*. Since the first leaf of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ now extant begins with iii. 2 (at the end of the verse) we cannot

[1] *Der Cyprianische Text der Acta apostolorum* 1892, p. 17.

compare it directly with Cyprian. Recent writers, however, argue that, as *Aug.*^{ab} and 𝔏^{h} both agree with Cyprian's quotations, *Aug.*^{ab} represent in chs. i–ii, so far as they go, the lost tradition of 𝔏^{h}. Burkitt goes so far as to say that in ii. 2 *sonus* (so *Cypr. Aug.*^{ab}) is the reading of 𝔏^{h}, which seems a bold statement.[1]

(2) The anonymous work *De Promissionibus* (*prom.*), written in Africa *c.* 440, as is shown by internal evidence, contains four quotations from Acts i–ii. 13 which show that the author used a text similar to that of *Aug.*^{ab}.

The most important of these occurs in ii. 7–8, where *D* has:

ουχ ιδου απαντες ουτοι εισιν
οι λαλουντες γαλιλαιοι
και πως ημεις ακουομεν
εκαστος την διαλεκτον ημων
εν η εγεννηθημεν

For this *prom.* has:

> nonne hi qui loquuntur natione sunt Galilaei? et quomodo agnoscimus in illis sermonem in quo nati sumus?

Aug.^{ab} agree verbally except that they have *omnes qui* for *hi qui*.

Here we have a number of interesting variants, viz.:

στ. 1 ἰδού *om.* 𝔏^{t} *vg.*^{a}, ℭ, *Aug.*^{ab} *prom.*
2 λαλοῦντες] + γένει *Aug.*^{ab} *prom.*
3–4 ἀκούομεν ἕκαστος] agnoscimus in illis *Aug.*^{ab} *prom.*
4 τὴν (+ ἰδίαν 𝔏^{g}) διάλεκτον *D*, 𝔏^{g}, *Aug.*^{ab} *prom.*: τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ (*sim.*) *cett.*
ib. ἡμῶν] *om. Aug.*^{ab} *prom.*

The other citations are:

i. 8. Here *D* has:

και εσεσθε μου μαρτυρες
εν τε ιερουσαλημ
και παση τη ιουδαια και σαμαρια
και εως εσχατου της γης

For this *prom.* has:

> et eritis mihi testes in totam (*al.* -ta) Iudaeam (*al.* -a) et Samariam et usque in fines terrae.

Here στ. 2 is omitted. *Aug.*^{ab} have στ. 2 and in στ. 4 *usque in totam terram.*

ib. 9–11. Here *prom.* gives:

> nubes suscepit eum et sublatus est a discipulis. 10 Et quomodo contemplantes erant eum cum iret in caelum duo viri astiterunt eis in albis. 11 qui et dixerunt, viri Galilaei, quid statis intuentes in caelum? Hic Iesus qui assumptus est a vobis sic veniet quemadmodum eum vidistis euntem in caelum.

[1] *J.T.H.* iii, p. 508.

Aug.^{b} (*def. Aug.*^{a}) agrees except for the following variants:

v. 9 a discipulis] ab eis *Aug.*^{b}

10 eum] *om. Aug.*^{b} duo] ecce duo *Aug.*^{b} (*cett.*) astiterunt eis in albis] astabant illis in veste alba

11 dixerunt] +ad eos *Aug.*^{b} intuentes] respicientes *Aug.*^{b} hic] iste *Aug.*^{b} est] +in caelum *Aug.*^{b}. (Here *prom.* = *D*, which omits εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν at the end of a στ.)

Otherwise *Aug.*^{b} = *prom.*

ii. 1–4. Here *prom.* gives:

> 1 Die autem pentecostes fuerunt omnes discipuli eadem animatione simul in unum. 2 Et factus est de caelo subito sonus quasi ferretur flatus vehemens et implevit totum illum locum in quo erant sedentes. 3 et visae sunt illis linguae divisae quasi ignis et insedit in unum quemque eorum. 4 et loquebantur variis linguis prout spiritus dabat eis pronuntiare.

In *v.* 4 *D* has:

> και επλησθησαν παντες πνευματος αγιου
> και ηρξαντο λαλειν ετεραις γλωσσαις

It will be observed that *prom.* omits στ. 1.

In this passage we have the evidence of *Aug.*^{a} as well as of *Aug.*^{b}. Also most of it is quoted by Cyprian (cf. p. 259).

At the beginning of ii. 1 the writer of *prom.* may be abbreviating, so I abstain from mentioning the variants of *Aug.*^{ab}. The addition of *discipuli*, peculiar to *prom.*, seems an expansion. Apart from these we have the following variants:

v. 1 eadem animatione simul *Aug.*^{a} *prom.*: simul *Aug.*^{b}
in unum *prom.*: in uno *Aug.*^{ab}

2 de caelo subito *prom.*: subito de caelo *Aug.*^{ab} *Cypr.*
totum illum locum *Aug.*^{a}, *prom.*: totum locum *Cypr.*: totam illam domum *Aug.*^{b}
in quo] in qua *Aug.*^{b}

3 in unum *Cypr. prom.*: super unum *Aug.*^{ab}
eorum *Aug.*^{b} *prom.*: illorum *Cypr.*, *Aug.*^{a}

4 et impleti sunt omnes spiritu sancto *Cypr.*, *Aug.*^{ab}: *om. prom.* (στ.)
loquebantur *prom.*: coeperunt loqui *Aug.*^{ab}
variis *Aug.*^{b}, *prom.*: *om. Aug.*^{a}
prout *prom.*: quomodo *Aug.*^{ab}

Apart from these variants *Cypr.*, *Aug.*^{ab}, and *prom.* agree verbally. The most important case of difference between *Aug.*^{a} and *Aug.*^{b} is in *v.* 1, where *Aug.*^{a} and *prom.* agree *soli* in a conflation of ὁμοθυμαδόν and ὁμοῦ.

Before quitting *prom.* I would note that it contains four quotations from portions of Acts where 𝔏^{h} is extant. One of these is somewhat interesting, viz. iii. 14–15, where 𝔏^{h} has (*sec. Berger*)

uos aute̅
scm̅ et] iustum negastis. et petistis homicidam
hominem] uiuere et donare uobis, principem autem uite
] ligno interemistis

Buchanan fills the blank at the beginning of l. 3 with *suspendentes* (after which he reads *occidistis* for *ligno interemistis*).

The reading of *prom.* is:

vos sanctum et iustum negastis et principem vitae aeternae interemistis (*med. om.*)

It is possible that *aeternae*, for which *prom.* seems to be the only authority, should be restored after *vitae* in $\mathfrak{L}^h$.

The other quotations in *prom.* are:

iv. 12 non esse aliud nomen sub caelo datum hominibus in quo nos oporteat salvari

ix. 15 vas est mihi electionis homo iste ut ferat nomen meum coram gentibus et regibus et filiis Israel

xiv. 22 per multas tribulationes oportet introire in regnum.

None of these shows any particular connexion between $\mathfrak{L}^h$ and *prom.*

It is worth while to notice that in another passage (*Serm.* 356. 1) Augustine speaks of a codex. We are there told that Lazarus, a deacon, first read a passage, Acts iv. 31–5. Then comes the statement, *cumque Lazarus diaconus recitasset et episcopo codicem tradidisset, Augustinus episcopus dixit, Et ego legere volo.* This he does without any variant. The codex used on this occasion contained one *Z* variant, viz. *v.* 31 *omni volenti* (omitting *credere*), but omitted in *v.* 32 καὶ οὐκ ἦν διάκρισις αὐτοῖς οὐδεμία (στ. in *D*), also Χριστοῦ in *v.* 33.

(3) 𝔏p (Perpinianus), thirteenth cent.

This MS. represents a text current in the south-east of France and in Catalonia which maintained itself against the Vulgate until the thirteenth century in the Albigensian districts of Languedoc. During this long struggle each of the rival texts left its mark upon the other. Thus in 𝔏p we find a large number of corrections, in many of which Old-Latin readings are struck out or additions are made from *vg*. On the other hand, many Vulgate MSS. contain a large selection of readings taken from this source.

There can be no doubt that in basis 𝔏p is a *Z* MS. Considering its late date (thirteenth cent.) and the fierce persecution to which the Albigensian church was subjected, it is singular that it has preserved to so large an extent its primitive character.

Although 𝔏p contains the whole of the Acts, it is only in chs. i.–xiii. 6 and xxviii. 16–31 that it gives an O.-L. text. In the intervening portions it is a Vulgate MS., with occasional variants, taken from an O.-L. source, probably the lost part of 𝔏p.

I now proceed to analyse its affinities:

(1) 𝔏p = *D*

ii. 15 *οὔσης ὥρας τῆς ἡμέρας τρίτης D*, 𝔏pt, *Iren. Aug.*: *ἔστιν γὰρ ὥρα τρίτη τῆς ἡμέρας cett.*

18 *καὶ προφητεύσουσιν om. D*, 𝔏p

iii. 1 *ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις D*, 𝔏p: *καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε* 𝔖vg: *om. cett.* (*στ.*)

v. 15 *ἀπηλλάσσοντο γὰρ ἀπὸ πάσης ἀσθενείας ἧς* (*ὡς*) *εἶχεν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν D*, 𝔏p (cf. *E*, 𝔏g *sim.*): *om. cett.* (*ὁμ.*)

xi. 9 *ἐκ δευτέρου om. D*, 𝔏p

27 *ἦν δὲ πολλὴ ἀγαλλίασις· συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν D*, 𝔏p, *Aug.*: *om. cett.* (2 *στ.*)

xii. 10 *κατέβησαν τοὺς ἑπτὰ* (*om. ἑπτά* 𝔏p) *βαθμοὺς D*, 𝔏p: *om. cett.* This is a very remarkable case.

It may be noted that in xi. 2, where a long omission occurs in Γ *cett.*, *D* and 𝔏p are the only authorities for the words *πολὺν λόγον ποιούμενος διὰ τῶν χωρῶν*.

To these may be added xii. 1 *ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ D* 614, 𝔏p, 𝔖ph: *om. cett.* Here *D*, 𝔏p are reinforced by other authorities.

Minor cases are:

iv. 17 *τι D*, 𝔏p: *om. cett.* v. 5 *παραχρῆμα D*, 𝔏p: *om. cett.* 15 *αὐτῶν D*, 𝔏p: *om. cett.* 36 *διελύθη D*, 𝔏p: *ἀνῃρέθη cett.* viii. 19 *κἀγώ D*, 𝔏p: *om. cett.* x. 17 *ἐγένετο D*, 𝔏p: *om. cett.* xi. 15 *αὐτοῖς D*, 𝔏p, *Aug.*: *om. cett.* xii 7 *τῷ Πέτρῳ D*, 𝔏p, 𝔈: *om. cett.* 11 *ὅτι ἀληθῶς DE*, 𝔏p: *ἀληθῶς ὅτι cett.* 16 *Πέτρος om. D*, 𝔏p

Attention has already been called (p. xxxix) to evidence which suggests that a distant ancestor of 𝔏p was derived from a MS. written in *στίχοι*. The most striking case is viii. 16, where the single word *ἐπιπεπτωκός*, omitted by 𝔏p, occupies a *στίχος* in *D*.

(2) 𝔏^{p} = *c.Th.*

viii. 39 ἀπ' αὐτοῦ *c.Th.*, 𝔏^{p}, *Aug.*^{c}: *om. cett.* (*def. D*)
x. 17 Κορνηλίου] +προσελθόντες καί *c.Th.*, 𝔏^{p}
xi. 5 λαμπράν *c.Th.*: λαμπρὰν μεγάλην 𝔏^{p} : μεγάλην *cett.*
xix. 6 ὥστε καὶ ἑρμηνεύειν αὐτὰς (-τοὺς) ἑαυτοῖς *c.Th.*, 𝔏^{p}, *Ephr.*: *om. cett.* (*D*)

The last case, which occurs in the Vulgate part of 𝔏^{p}, is especially noticeable.

(3) 𝔏^{p} = *D c.Th.*

x. 24 περιέμεινεν *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{p} : *om. cett.*
xi. 26 καὶ (ὡς) συντυχὼν παρεκάλεσεν ἐλθεῖν *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{p}: καὶ εὑρὼν ἤγαγεν *cett.*
xii. 3 ἡ ἐπιχείρησις αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς πιστούς *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{p} (ἁγίους καὶ πιστ. 𝔏^{p}) : *om. cett.* (στ.)

(4) I now pass to a very interesting point, viz. the relation of 𝔏^{p} to 𝔖^{ph}, generally in asterisked passages. I notice first some simple cases:

x. 19 διενθυμουμένου] + καὶ διαποροῦντος 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph}
39 ἀνεῖλον] ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ ἀνεῖλον 𝔏^{t}, 𝔖^{ph}. A similar reading seems to have been erased in 𝔏^{p}, which has *quem* . . . . . . *iudaei in* . . . . (+*interfecerunt m.* 2)
xii. 5 ὑπὸ τῆς σπείρης τῆς βασιλικῆς 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett.* (*D*)
25 ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Παῦλος 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph} (+614) : *om. cett.* (*D*)
xxviii. 31 ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ δι' οὗ μέλλει πᾶς ὁ κόσμος κρίνεσθαι 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph}: *om. cett.* (*def. D*)

In others 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph} are found in combination with *D*, e.g.:

v. 22 καὶ ἀνοίξαντες τὴν φυλακὴν *D*, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett.* (στ.)
x. 33 παρακαλῶν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ἡμᾶς *D*, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph}: *om. cett.* (στ.)
xi. 2 ὁ μὲν οὖν Πέτρος δι' ἱκανοῦ χρόνου ἠθέλησεν πορευθῆναι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ προσφωνήσας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ἐπιστηρίξας αὐτοὺς ἐξῆλθεν (*om.* ἐξῆλθεν *D*) *D*, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett.*
12 μηδὲν διακρίνοντα *om. D*, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph}
17 τοῦ μὴ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα ἅγιον *D*, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Aug.*: *om. cett.* (στ.)
xii. 1 ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ *D* 614, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett.*
22 καταλλαγέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῖς Τυρίοις (+καὶ τοῖς Σιδωνίοις 𝔏^{p2}) *D*, 𝔏^{p2}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Ephr.*: *om. cett.* (στ.)

In some cases 𝔏^{g}, as well as 𝔏^{p}, agrees with 𝔖^{ph}, e.g.:

xi. 1 καὶ εὐχαρίστουν τῷ θεῷ 𝔖^{ph} : καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεόν 𝔏^{gp2} : *om. cett.* (*D*)
xxviii 16 ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης παρέδωκεν τοὺς δεσμίους τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῳ δ, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett.*
ib. ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς 614, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett.*
19 ἀλλ' ἵνα λυτρώσωμαι τὴν ψυχήν μου ἐκ θανάτου 614, 𝔏^{gh}, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett.*
29 καὶ ταῦτα αὐτοῦ εἰπόντος ἀπῆλθον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πολλὴν ἔχοντες ἐν ἑαυτοῖς συζήτησιν δ, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{ph} : *om. cett.*

In other cases the combination is joined by 𝔏^{h}, especially in ix. 4–8.

This body of evidence seems to show a striking resemblance between the Greek original from which $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ is drawn and the Greek MS., or MSS., from which the asterisked readings in $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ were derived.

In connexion with $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ it will be convenient to refer briefly to $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$. Agreements between $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ and $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ are few and insignificant, as compared with those between $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, and $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$. On the other hand, the combination *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ is not infrequent, e.g.:

ii. 34 *εἴρηκεν γάρ D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *λέγει δέ cett.*
iii. 2 *ἰδού D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.*
iv. 21 *μή . . . αἰτίαν D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *μηδέν cett.*
viii. 9 *προϋπάρχων D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *προϋπῆρχεν cett.*
xi. 26 *οἵτινες παραγενόμενοι . . . συνεχύθησαν D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *ἐγένετο δὲ αὐτοῖς . . . συναχθῆναι cett.*

It is clear that the *Z* reading, found in *D*, has here descended to $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ and $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$. These passages, therefore, can be taken in connexion with the agreements of *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, *sol.*, previously quoted.

(5) I now say a few words concerning the relation of $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ to $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$. It is clear that the two MSS. are closely connected in basis. This will be seen from, e.g.:

ii. 19 *αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ*] *om. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$
46 *ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$
v. 40 *ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς*] $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ have a common dislocation
vii. 51 *καὶ ὑμεῖς*] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$
xii. 18 *οὐκ ὀλίγος*] *om. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$
xxviii. 27 *καὶ τοῖς ὦσιν βαρέως ἤκουσαν*] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$
30 *καὶ διελέγετο* $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$: *om. cett.*

It is unnecessary to multiply examples, since these agreements are extremely frequent.

On the other hand they often differ in the retention of the longer *Z* readings. Sometimes one MS. and sometimes the other has been brought into conformity with the shorter text. The chief passages in which $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ appears to a disadvantage as opposed to $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ are v. 29, 39, x. 25. Instances in which $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ preserves *Z* readings which have disappeared from $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ have already been given, the most important being iii. 1, xi. 27, xii. 10.

I now mention a few notable readings of $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ which it is difficult to classify:

vii. 2–4 $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ agrees with Irenaeus in giving a shortened version here. Blass follows $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, *Iren.*, '*pro lectione ceterorum male interpolata*'.

viii. 37 *εἶπεν δὲ . . . Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gpt}$, $\mathfrak{S}$, *Aug.*: cf. *Iren.*, *Cypr.*: *om. cett.* Here $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ agrees with $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$.

39 *ἅγιον* (*κυρίου* $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$) *ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐνοῦχον, ἄγγελος δὲ A* (*m.* 1 *in ras.*), $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Aug. Ephr.*: *om. cett.* Here $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ are reinforced by *A*.

xxiv. 6–7 *καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἡμέτεραν νόμον . . . ἔρχεσθαι πρός σε E* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ (*et ex parte* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$), $\mathfrak{S}$: *om. cett.*

In viii. 37, 39, xxiv. 7 *D* is not extant. It will be noted that in viii. 37, xxiv. 7, *E* appears as a witness. It is highly probable that *E* is founded upon

D in both verses. I have noticed one curious passage where *E* and $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ agree in what seems to be an interpolation, viz. vii. 16 Ἀβραάμ] + ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ *sol.* In v. 3 the reading πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Πέτρος, Ἀνανία is peculiar to *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}$.

The chief original contributions of $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ appear to be:

iii. 6 περιπάτει] + ἐν εἰρήνῃ

v. 5 πεσὼν] + ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν (*Bl.*)

17 ἀναστάς] Ἄννας (*Bl.*)

viii. 1 τῇ ἀναιρέσει αὐτοῦ] τῇ πονηρίᾳ αὐτῶν

x. 41 ἀναστῆναι] + καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (*Bl.*). Cf. *Ephr.*, 'about forty days he remained and afterwards ascended'.

xii. 22 ὁ δῆμος $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: ὁ δὲ δῆμος *cett.* (*D*). Here δέ has been inserted in Γ, *cett.*, to botch after omission of a στ., and been combined with the full reading in *D*.

xiii. 1. ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν] καθ' ἑκάστην ἐκκλησίαν $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ (*Bl.*)

xxviii. 31 διϊσχυριζόμενος $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ (*Bl.*): *om. cett.*

ib. τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ (*Bl.*)

In x. 42 Blass follows $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ *sol.* in omitting τῷ λαῷ.

I have not included in this list some interpolations, e.g.:

ii. 42 προσευχαῖς] + προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδόν $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ (*ex v.* 46)

45 ἐπίπρασκον] + καὶ ἐτίθουν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ (*ex* iv. 35)

I conclude with a few remarks about the corrections ($\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$). Ropes (p. cviii) says that these come from 'a pure Languedocian Vulgate text'. I am not sure what is meant by this expression. To me they seem to be a farrago of readings taken from various sources. As a rule *Z* readings are cancelled, but occasionally they are inserted by the corrector, e.g. i. 15 ἐν δέ (*D*), iii. 2 ἰδόυ (*D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$), 4 ἐμβλέψας (*D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$), vii. 49 ἐστίν (*D*, *vg.* $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$), xii. 22 καταλλαγέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῖς Τυρίοις (*D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$). In some cases the corrector seems to have drawn from the Vulgate, e.g. v. 3 ἐπλήρωσεν] ἐπείρασεν *vg*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$: xi. 22 ἠκούσθη] pervenit *vg.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$. As examples of other agreements I quote iii. 11 αὐτοῦ] τοῦ ἰαθέντος χωλοῦ δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$: iv. 8 Ἰσραήλ] οἴκου Ἰσραήλ $\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: xi. 1 καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν Θεόν $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$.

(4) $\mathfrak{L}^{t}$ (Liber comicus), eleventh cent.

This MS. owes its odd name to the fact that it is a lectionary. Ducange gives under the heading *liber comitis* a number of references which show that a lectionary was frequently called *comes, liber comes*, or *liber comitis*, in the same way as the term 'Companion' is now employed. The mis-spelling *comicus* is found in Spanish MSS.

The text of $\mathfrak{L}^{t}$ has been edited by Dom Morin,[1] who says that it was used in the church of Toledo in the seventh century. It is therefore of considerable historical importance as a witness to the diffusion in Spain of an Old-Latin text similar to that current in the South of France.

Jülicher has pointed out that $\mathfrak{L}^{t}$ is a composite document.[2] While the majority of the lessons are O.-L. in character, others are drawn from or based upon the Vulgate. He classifies them as follows:

(*a*) O.-L. i. 1–11, 15–26, ii. 1–21, 22–41, iv. 32–7, v. 1–11, vi. 1–15, vii. 1–2, 51–60, viii. 1–4, x. 25–43.

(*b*) Vulg. ii. 42–7, v. 12–16, viii. 14–25, 26–40, ix. 1–22, 32–42, xiii. 26–39.

It is to be noticed that sporadic O.-L. readings occur in the lessons taken from the Vulgate. These are most frequent in ix. 4–6, where $\mathfrak{L}^{t}$ is in general agreement with the longer text given by $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$. In these verses the Clementine Vulgate contains some of these O.-L. readings, e.g. *v.* 6 *Et tremens ac stupens dixit* (with $\mathfrak{L}^{hpt}$ and $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$), which are absent from the best MSS. of *vg.*, and omitted by Wordsworth and White. Others, however, did not get into the Clementine Vulgate, e.g. *v.* 4 *μετὰ μεγάλης ἐκστάσεως* $\mathfrak{L}^{hpt}$: *om. cett.*; *v.* 6 *ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι αὐτῷ* $\mathfrak{L}^{ht}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: *om. cett.*

I do not propose to analyse the variants of $\mathfrak{L}^{t}$ as I have done in the case of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, and $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, since this would involve needless repetition. I will content myself with saying that the chief affinities of $\mathfrak{L}^{t}$ appear to be with $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$. This may be seen by a glance at the apparatus to ix. 4–6. An especially striking agreement with $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ is x. 39, where for *ὃν καὶ ἀνεῖλαν cett.* (*D*), $\mathfrak{L}^{t}$ gives *quem Iudaei reppulerunt et occiderunt.* This appears to have been the reading of $\mathfrak{L}^{p1}$, and is also given by $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$. There are also agreements with $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ alone or in combination with $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$, but I cannot follow Jülicher in stating that $\mathfrak{L}^{t}$ is similar to $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$.

[1] *Anecdota Maredsolana* i (1893).

[2] *Zeitsch. f. die neutest. Wiss.* xv (1914), p. 172.

(5) $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ (Gigas), thirteenth cent.

This MS., so called on account of its great size, appears to have been written in Bohemia early in the thirteenth century. It originally belonged to the Benedictine Abbey of Podlazic, but in 1295 was acquired by the Abbey of Brevnov. At a later date it was transferred to Prague. On the capture of that city by the Swedes in 1648 it was taken to Sweden, and it is now in the Royal Library at Stockholm. It contains the whole of the Old and New Testaments, in addition to other works. It is only in the Acts and the Apocalypse that it contains an Old-Latin text.[1]

In spite of its late date $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ is a MS. of great interest for several reasons.

(*a*) It is the only O.-L. MS. of the Acts which is complete. Where the other witnesses fail, we are dependent solely upon it for our knowledge of the O.-L. tradition.

(*b*) Its text corresponds closely with the quotations of Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia, who is said to have composed his works when in exile, between 355 and 362. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ therefore represents a type of text which was current before the recension of Jerome.

(*c*) It was taken from a Greek text which was widely circulated in the East. This is evident from its numerous agreements with $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ and $\mathfrak{E}$. It is an interesting fact that pap. Oxy. 1597, cent. iii–iv, confirms a striking variant known otherwise only from $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$.[2]

(*d*) Very interesting questions arise concerning the connexion of $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ with $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, and Jerome's Vulgate. That the Vulgate is based on $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ is generally acknowledged.

The tradition of $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ is also represented in positions of chs. vii and viii by a MS. at Milan known as g_2, cent. x–xi,[3] and by a Vienna MS. (from Bobbio), known as *s*, cent. v–vi.[4] In spite of the early date of $\mathfrak{L}^{s}$ it represents a later stage in the development than $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$.

$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ is in basis a *Z* MS., closely connected with *D*. It has, however, been severely castigated, both by the excision of longer readings and the infiltration of variants from Γ.

So far as style is concerned, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ marks a distinct advance on $\mathfrak{L}^{hpt}$, not to speak of $\mathfrak{L}^{de}$. Though terse and literal, it is by no means devoid of literary quality and power.

(1) I proceed to consider agreements between *D* and $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$. I take first common omissions:

ii. 18 *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις om. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

19 *αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ om. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$

[1] B. Dudík, *Forschung in Schweden für Mährens Geschichte*, 1852, pp. 207–235. Antonin Friedl, *Památky Archaeologicke* xxxv (1927) Prag, pp. 117–67 (plates xxxiii–lxv).

[2] Acts xxvi. 7. Cf. note *ad loc.*

[3] Ceriani, *Monum. Sacra et Prof.* i, fasc. ii, pp. 127–8.

[4] *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, iv.

20 καὶ ἐπιφανῆ *om. D*, ℵ $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$
xii. 18 οὐκ ὀλίγος *om. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$
xvi. 36 ἐν εἰρήνῃ *om. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$
xvii. 18 ὅτι τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν εὐηγγελίζετο *om. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$
xviii. 3 ἦσαν γὰρ σκηνοποιοὶ τῇ τέχνῃ *om. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

In xii. 18 the omission is due to ὁμ. (after τάραχος). In the other passages the omitted words come at the end of a στίχος in *D* and represent lost στίχοι.

(2) Passages found in *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, omitted by *cett.*:

viii. 19 παρακαλῶν καί *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$: *om. cett.*
xv. 34 μόνος δὲ Ἰούδας ἐπορεύθη *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *om. cett.* (στ.)
xviii. 25 ἐν τῇ πατρίδι *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *om. cett.*
xix. 26 τίς ποτε (τότε) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *om. cett.*
xxi. 1 καὶ Μύρα *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*
25 οὐδὲν ἔχουσιν λέγειν πρός σε *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, 𝔈 : *om. cett.* (στ.)
xxii. 26 ὅτι Ῥωμαῖον αὐτὸν λέγει *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *om. cett.* (στ.)

(3) Notable readings :

xiii. 33 πρώτῳ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: δευτέρῳ *cett.*
xiv. 27 μετὰ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν, *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: μετ' αὐτῶν *cett.*
xvii. 28 καθ' ὑμᾶς *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: + ποιητῶν *cett.*
xx. 4 Δουβ||ριος *D* : Douerius $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$: Doberius $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: Δερβαῖος *cett.*
16 κατάσχεσίς τις *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: χρονοτριβῆσαι *cett.*

(4) Minor agreements :

v. 16 πλῆθος *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: καὶ τὸ πλῆθος *cett.* vi. 1 ταύταις ταῖς ἡμέραις *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ταῖς ἡμ. ταύταις *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) vii. 12 οὖν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: δὲ *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) x. 8 τὸ ὅραμα $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$ (*def. D*) : ἅπαντα αὐτοῖς *cett.* 33 παρά σου *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *om. cett.* xii. 4 τοῦτον *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ὃν καί *cett.* 7 νύξας *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: πατάξας *cett.* xiii. 30 ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν *cett.* xiv. 13 ἱερεῖ . . . ἐνέγκαντες . . . ἤθελον *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ἱερεύς . . . ἐνέγκας . . . ἤθελεν *cett.* xvi. 9 παρακαλῶν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: + αὐτὸν *cett.* 17 δοῦλοι *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ἄνθρωποι δοῦλοι *cett.* xvii. 14 ἐπί *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ὡς ἐπί *cett.* 27 ὃ θεῖον ἐστιν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: τὸ θεῖον *cett.* 31 μέλλει *om. D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ ib. παρασχεῖν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: παρασχὼν *cett.* xviii. 24 γένει Ἀλεξανδρεύς *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: Ἀλεξ. τῷ γένει *cett.* 25 ἀπελάλει (*eloquebatur*) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ἐλάλει *cett.* 26 οὗτος *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, 𝔈 : οὗτός τε *cett.* xix. 13 ἐκ τῶν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: καὶ τῶν *cett.* xix. 27 ἡμῖν κινδυνεύει *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: κινδ. ἡμῖν *cett.* 30 βουλομένου δὲ τοῦ Παύλου *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: τοῦ δὲ Π. βουλ. *cett.* 32 ἄλλο *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ἄλλο τι *cett.* xx. 27 τοῦ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: τοῦ μή *cett.* xxi. 2 τὸν Παῦλον *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *om. cett.* 36 τὸ πλῆθος *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: + τοῦ λαοῦ *cett.* xxii. 3 ζηλωτής *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: + ὑπάρχων *cett.* 26 τοῦτο ἀκούσας *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ἀκούσας δέ *cett.* 27 εἰμί *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ναί *cett.*

To these may be added a notable case where a *proprius error* occurring in *D*, 614, and $\mathfrak{L}^{ph}$ is further developed in $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$:

xiii. 17 καὶ τὸν λαὸν ὕψωσεν] διὰ τὸν λαὸν ὕψωσεν *D*, 614, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: perpetuum populum exaltavit $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$. Here *perpetuum* is a corruption of *propter*.

The evidence of Lucifer, whose quotations generally agree minutely with the readings of $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, shows that a number of readings characteristic of *D* have disappeared from $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ in the course of transmission.[1] It will be sufficient here to quote:

xiii. 6 Βαριησουαν (Bariesuam $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$) *D*: Bariesubam *Luc.*: Βαριησοῦς *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)
8 Ἑτοιμᾶς *D*: Etoemas $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, *Luc.*: Ἐλύμας *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

I do not propose to discuss here the relations of $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ to other authorities, since these have been, or will be, treated elsewhere. It will be sufficient to say that its agreements with $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ are especially remarkable.

$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ contains various doublets. I quote the following cases:

vii. 2 πρὶν ἢ κατοικῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐν Χαρράν] priusquam habitaret in Charan priusquam mortuus est pater eius (*ex v.* 4)

xxii. 5 καὶ ὅλον τὸ πρεσβυτέριον] καὶ πάντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: totum concilium et omnes seniores $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

xxiv. 5 πᾶσιν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην] non tantum generi nostro sed fere universo orbi terrarum et omnibus Iudaeis

xxvi. 3 ζητημάτων] sectam et quaestiones legis

xxvii. 30 προφάσει] occasionem quaerentes sub obtentu[2]

xxviii. 22 πανταχοῦ ἀντιλέγεται] contradicitur in toto orbe $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: ubique contradicitur ei in toto orbe $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

The longer *Z* variants are generally absent from $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, though there are striking exceptions. On the other hand it contains certain additions to the usual text. The chief cases are:

xii. 7 ἐν τάχει] + et surrexit $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.*

xvi. 29 αἰτήσας] quo audito custos carceris petiit $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Luc.*

xx. 7 αὐτοῖς] + et confirmabat animas illorum $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

xxi. 10 ἡμῶν] + in Caesarea $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

xxii. 5 τιμωρηθῶσιν] + si qui de hac via essent $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

xxiii. 27 μαθὼν ὅτι Ῥωμαῖός ἐστιν] clamantem ac dicentem se esse civem Romanum $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

xxiv. 26 μεταπεμπόμενος] + secrete $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Tert.*

xxv. 21 ἐπικαλεσαμένου] appellavit Caesarem et petiit $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

ib. διάγνωσιν] + cumque eum non possem (-et) iudicare $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

xxvii. 29 γενέσθαι] + ut sciremus an salvi esse possimus $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

30 ἐκτείνειν] + ut tutius navis staret

All these additions, except those in xxi. 10, xxii. 5, xxiv. 26, are accepted by Blass.

[1] Cf. p. 212.

[2] Cf. Mt. xxiii. 13 προφάσει] occasione $\mathfrak{L}^{bc}$: sub obtentu $\mathfrak{L}^{f}$: Mk. xii. 40 occasione $\mathfrak{L}^{ab}$, *alii*: sub obtentu *vg.* (Blass in Acts xxvii. 30 prints εὐκαιρίαν ζητούντων προφάσει).

Minor cases are:

xix. 13 κηρύσσει] + ut exeatis xxiv. 23 τηρεῖσθαι] diligenter custodire
xxvii. 42 ἵνα] + omnes 44 σανίσιν] + salvos fieri

The following omissions of $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ may be recorded:

iv. 19 πρὸς αὐτούς (so *Luc.*), 28 γενέσθαι (so *Luc.*): vii. 16 καὶ ἐτέθησαν . . . Συχέμ: viii. 14 τοῦ θεοῦ: ix. 17 ὅπως ἀναβλέψῃς, 27 ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ: x. 3 τοῦ θεοῦ: xii. 12 καὶ προσευχόμενοι (στ. in *D*): xiii. 21 ὁ θεός, *ib.* ἐκ φυλῆς: xiv. 15 καὶ φωνοῦντες (λέγοντες): xvi. 20 τοῖς στρατηγοῖς (so *Luc.*), 33 παραχρῆμα (so *Luc.*): xvii. 4 τῶν πρώτων: xix. 7 οἱ πάντες: xx. 31 γρηγορεῖτε . . . ἡμέραν (*hab. Luc.*): xxi. 1 καὶ ἐπιβάντες ἀνήχθημεν (ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο ἀναχθῆναι ἡμᾶς), so also $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, 28 τοῦ λαοῦ καί: xxii. 4 ταύτην τὴν ὁδόν, 6 περὶ ἐμέ, 15 καὶ ἤκουσας: xxiii. 6 ὁ Παῦλος, 18 προσκαλεσάμενος (so *vg.*[cl]), 21 αὐτοῖς, 29 ζητημάτων, ib. ἢ δεσμῶν: xxiv. 21 ἐν αὐτοῖς ἑστώς: xxv. 20 περὶ τούτων: xxvi. 15 ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπα . . . εἶπεν, ib. ὃν σὺ διώκεις, 18 εἰς φῶς καί: xxvii. 15 ἐφερόμεθα, 43 ἀπορρίψαντας: xxviii. 15 τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν (so *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$).

I now proceed to treat the relations of $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ to $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, also to $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ and *vg.* It has already been shown that $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ is composed of two elements, *viz.* a literal translation of *D* and help furnished by a Latin MS. resembling $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$. There is a more intimate connexion between $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, and *vg.*

This can easily be seen by simple inspection. I therefore give the readings of $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, and *vg.* in two passages. The first is xvi. 16–20. I arrange $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, and *vg.* in στίχοι, as found in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$.

$\mathfrak{L}^{d}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$
contigitquae euntibus nobis	factum est autem euntibus nobis
ad orationem puella quendam	ad orationem puellam quandam
habentem spm̄ phytonem	habentem spiritum fitonis
obuiam fieri nobis	occurrere nobis
quae reditum multum praestabat dominis suis	quae reditum multum praestabat dominis suis
per hoc diuinando	diuinando
haec persecuta est paulum et nos	haec subsecuta est paulum et nos
et clamabat dicens	et clamabat dicens
hi serui dī excelsi sunt	hi serui dei excelsi
qui euangelizant nobis uiam salutis	qui praedicant nobis uiam salutis.
hoc autem faciebat per multos dies	hoc faciebat per multos dies
conuersus autem paulus in spū	quod cum indoluisset paulus
et cum indoluisset dixit	conuersus ad spiritum ait
praecipio tibi in nomine ihū xp̄i	praecipio tibi in nomine ihesu christi
ut exeas ab eam et eadem hora exiit	ut exeas ab ea et exiit eadem hora.
cum uidissent domini eius puelles	uidentes autem domini eius
quoniam ispes et reditus eorum	quia exiuit spes reditus eorum
quem habebant per ipsam	* * * * * * *
adpraehenderunt paulum et silam	apprehensum paulum et sylean

$\mathfrak{L}^{d}$

traxerunt in forum ad magistratos
et cum optulissent eos praetoribus
dixerunt isti homines
perturbam nostram ciuitatem
iudaei cum sint
et praedicantes gentes
quam non licet nobis recipere nec facere
romani cum simus

$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$

traxerunt ad forum ad magistratum
et obtulerunt eos
dicentes homines hi
conturbant ciuitatem nostram
cum sint iudaei
et praedicant sectam
quam non licet nobis recipere nec facere
cum simus romani

$\mathfrak{L}^{e}$

factum est autem euntibus nobis
in orationem puellam quandam
habentem spiritum phthonis
obuiare nobis
quae quaestum multum praestabat dominis suis
diuinando
haec subsecuta paulo et nobis
clamabat dicens
hi homines serui dei excelsi sunt
qui adnuntiant nouis uiam salutis
hoc autem faciebat per multos dies
dolens autem paulus
et conuersus spiritui dixit
praecipio tibi in nomine ihesu christi
ut exeas ab ea et exiit eadem hora
uidentes autem domini eius
quia exiit spes operationis eorum
* * * * * * * *
adprehendentes paulum et silam
duxerunt in forum ad principes
et obtulentes eos magistratibus
dixerunt hi homines
conturbant nostram ciuitatem
iudaei cum sint
et praedicant mores
quot non licet nobis recipere neque facere
romanis constitutis.[1]

vg.

factum est autem euntibus nobis
ad orationem puellam quandam
habentem spiritum pythonem
obuiare nobis
quae quaestum magnum praestabat dominis suis
diuinando
haec subsecuta paulum et nos
clamabat dicens
isti homines serui dei excelsi sunt
qui adnuntiant nobis uiam salutis
hoc autem faciebat multis diebus
dolens autem paulus
et conuersus spiritui dixit
praecipio tibi in nomine Iesu Christi
exire ab ea et exiit eadem hora
uidentes autem domini eius
quia exiit spes quaestus eorum
* * * * * * * *
apprehendentes paulum et silam
perduxerunt in forum ad principes
et offerentes eos magistratibus
dixerunt hi homines
conturbant ciuitatem nostram
cum sint iudaei
et adnuntiant morem
quam non licet nobis suscipere neque facere
cum simus romani

[1] The use of *constitutus* as a rendering of ὤν or ὑπάρχων is rare in N.T. MSS. In $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ it occurs once (Lk. xiv. 32). It is found in Jn. v. 13 in $\mathfrak{L}^{aff}$ and *vg.*, and in Lk. iii. 1 in $\mathfrak{L}^{q}$. It is, however, frequent in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ in Acts (12 examples). *Constitutus* in this sense is especially frequent in Tertullian, but is also common in Cyprian. It also occurs in Apuleius, Minucius Felix, and other early writers. The Latin Irenaeus has it not infrequently, but prefers *existens*, which occurs once in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ (Acts xxii. 3). In Ambrosiaster the regular rendering is *positus*, but *constitutus* is also found.

The composite character of 𝔏^{d} is clear. On the one hand it differs from 𝔏^{g} in various passages where *D* has a different reading, viz.

l. 6 διὰ τοῦτο *D*: *om. cett.* 10 εὐαγγελίζονται *D*, 𝔖^{vg}: καταγγέλλουσιν *cett.* 12–13 ἐπιστρέψας δὲ ὁ Παῦλος τῷ πνεύματι καὶ διαπονηθεὶς *D*: διαπον. δὲ Π. καὶ ἐπιστ. τῷ πνεύματι *cett.* 16 τῆς παιδίσκης *D*: αὐτῆς *cett.* 18 ἧς εἶχον δι' αὐτῆς *D*: *om. cett.* 25 ἔθη] ἔθνη *D* (*errore*).

On the other hand the general similarity of the language is obvious at a glance. In l. 15 *D* has εὐθέως ἐξῆλθεν, while *cett.* (𝔏^{g}) have ἐξῆλθεν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, so 𝔏^{d}. In l. 17 *D* has ἀπεστερησθαι (*sic*), while *cett.* give ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἐλπίς. 𝔏^{d} adopts ἡ ἐλπίς in place of ἀπεστερησθαι, but omits ἐξῆλθεν, thus producing nonsense.

The text of 𝔏^{g} does not call for comment, except that it omits τοῖς στρατηγοῖς in l. 21.

So far as vocabulary and arrangement are concerned, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔏^{e}, and *vg.* go together. While 𝔏^{e} is closely connected with 𝔏^{g}, it is almost identical with *vg.*

I now take *vv.* 26–30 in the same chapter.

𝔏^{d}	𝔏^{g}
repente autem terrae motus factus est magnus	derepente autem terrae motus factus est magnus
ita ut commouerentur fundamenta carceris	ita ut concuterentur omnia fundamenta carceris
apertequae sunt statim ianuae omnes	et ostia aperta sunt
et omnium uincula relaxata sunt	et omnium uincula soluta sunt
et exomnis factus est optio carceris	experge autem factus est custos carceris
ut uidit apertas ianuas carceris	et cum uidisset ostia aperta carceris
euaginato gladio	exemit gladium
coeperat se interficere	ut se interficeret
existimans effugisset custodias	estimans effugisse uinctos
clamauit autem magna uoce paulus dicens	exclamauit autem paulus uoce magna dicens
nihil feceris tibi malum	nichil tibi male feceris
omnes enim sumus hic	omnes enim hic sumus
lumen uero petens accucurrit	quo audito custos carceris petiit lumen et ingressus est
et tremibundus factus	et tremens
procidit ad pedes paulo et silae	procidit ad pedes pauli et sylee
et cum produxisset eos foras	et cum produxisset eos foras
ceteros custodiuit	* * * * * * *

𝔏^{e}	*vg.*
repente autem terrae motus factus est magnus	subito uero terrae motus factus est magnus
ut moueri fundamenta carceris	ita ut mouerentur fundamenta carceris

$\mathfrak{L}^{e}$	*vg.*
aperta sunt autem protinus ostiae omnes	et aperta sunt statim ostia omnia
et uniuersorum uincula soluta sunt	et uniuersorum uincula soluta sunt
experge autem factus custos carceris	expergefactus autem custos carceris
et uidens apertas ianuas carceris	et uidens apertas ianuas carceris
stringens gladium	euaginato gladio
incipiebat se interficere	uolebat se interficere
aestimans effugisse uinctos	aestimans fugisse uinctos
exclamauit autem uoce magna paulus dicens	clamauit autem paulus magna uoce dicens
nihil feceris tibi mali	nihil feceris tibi mali
omnis enim sumus in praesente	uniuersi enim hic sumus
petens autem lumen introgressus est	petitoque lumine introgressus est
et tremefactus	et tremefactus
procidit paulo et silae	procidit paulo et silae[1]
et producens eos foris	et producens eos foras
* * * * * *	* * * * * *

$\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ here requires no special comment, except that in l. 17 it renders the reading of *D*, τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀσφαλισάμενος, so $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: *om. cett.* In l. 15 πρὸς τοὺς πόδας is given by *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}$: *om. cett.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ omits παραχρῆμα (with *B*) in l. 3 and in l. 13 has an addition (= ἀκούσας δὲ τοῦτο ὁ δεσμοφύλαξ), probably an interpolation. $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ has a striking Graecism in l. 2 *ut moveri* (ὥστε σαλευθῆναι) and a little flourish in l. 12 *in praesente* for *hic*. Generally speaking $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ is nearer to *vg.* than $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ is, but the relation is by no means so close as in *vv.* 16–20. So far the passage does not seem very instructive. The reason why it is here quoted is that in l. 5 we have a very extraordinary agreement between $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, viz. *experge autem factus*. The same reading appears in the quotation of Lucifer.[2] No other example, so far as I am aware, is known of this remarkable tmesis.[3] In *E* the passage is given thus:

experge autem	εξυπνος δε
factus	γενομενος

Such an error seems more likely to have originated in a MS. arranged like *E* than to have been imported into it.

The general result of these observations is to confirm the judgement of Jülicher, who says that '*e*, *gig.* and *vg.* had behind them one and the same recension of the Latin Acts,' and that '*d* made use of the same recension'.

According to this view, which appears to me self-evident, the Vulgate

[1] + ad pedes *vg*cl.

[2] Zahn on xvi. 27 says that Lucifer has *experge factus* 'without *autem*' and the same error appears in A. M. Coleman's collation of Lucifer's quotations with the text of $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ (1927).

[3] Cf. Löfstedt, *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, pp. 184–8.

occupies the same position towards $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ in the Acts which it holds towards $\mathfrak{L}^{b\,ff}$ and other O.-L. MSS. in Evv. Jerome adopted the current Latin text of his time as the basis of his text, and transmuted it by the charm of his literary style. All this is quite simple. There are, however, certain obscurities as to the exact part, if any, played by $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ in this development.

According to Jülicher's view $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ is posterior to $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and in places dependent upon it. Thus he explains the curious form *obtulentes* in the first extract given above (l. 21) as a mixture of *obtulerunt* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$) and *offerentes* (*vg.*). So in xxv. 17 where *E* has:

sine ulla	μηδεμιαν
dilatione	αναβολην
faciens	ποιησαμενος

he shows that the three Greek words are rendered in $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and *vg.* by *sine ulla dilatione*, without *faciens*. $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ combines this reading with a rendering of ποιησάμενος. It may be remarked here that the third line in *E* comes at the beginning of a new page (215^r^), and that errors or inconsistencies are frequent at such points, e.g.:

143^r^	dimitte	απολυσον
	homines	τους ανους
143^v^	haec	εκεινους
169^v^	sermone	λογω
170^r^	multi	πολλω
195^v^	et omnem	και παν
196^r^	concilium	το συνεδριον

The writer, when he began a new page, was apt to forget what he had already written on the other side.

Jülicher does not discuss the evidence furnished by the large array of Graecisms found in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, which show the general priority of the Greek text. The differences between the Greek and Latin sides are trifling. The Greek cannot have been translated from the Latin, though it may have been influenced by it, since, apart from certain variations, it is the ordinary Greek text. If the Latin was translated from the Greek, why does it so curiously resemble $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and *vg.*? If it is an adaptation of a Latin text similar to $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*, why are there not mixed readings similar to those found in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$?

Although $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ in point of vocabulary resembles *vg.* more than $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, in some ways it seems to be prior to $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$. In point of style $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ resembles $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, that is to say, it is destitute of style, while $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ is written in good and correct Latin, only inferior to that of *vg.* $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ is conspicuous for its Graecisms, while $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ is equally conspicuous for its avoidance of them. It seems strange that in the second extract (l. 2) $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ should have *ut moveri* (= ὥστε σαλευθῆναι), while $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has *ut moverentur*. A number of instances may be produced in which the rendering of $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ looks like a first attempt, which was subsequently improved by $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and *vg.* Thus in the first extract (l. 17) for ἐργασίας $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ has *operationis*, a literal translation of the Greek, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ improves on this with *reditus*, and Jerome finds *le mot juste* with *quaestus*. We may compare:

iv. 36 παρακλήσεως] obsecrationis $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: exhortationis $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: consolationis *vg.*

v. 35 προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς] attendite se ipsis $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: attendite vobis $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*

vii. 58 παρὰ τοὺς πόδας νεανίου καλουμένου Σαύλου] ante pedes adulescens vocante Sauli $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: ante pedes adulescentis cuiusdam nomine Sauli $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: secus pedes adulescentis qui vocabatur Saulus *vg.*

ix. 39 ὃν παραγενόμενον ἀνήγαγον] quem advenientem ascenderunt $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: cumque advenissent duxerunt eum $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: et cum advenisset duxerunt illum *vg.*

xv. 20 ἐπιστεῖλαι αὐτοῖς] innotuere eis $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: scribendum ad eos $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: scribere ad eos *vg.*

xvii. 16 κατείδωλον] circa simulacrum $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: circa idola $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: idolatriae deditam *vg.*

xx. 24 οὐδὲ ἔχω τὴν ψυχήν μου τιμίαν ἐμαυτῷ] nec habeo animam pretiosiorem me in ipso $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: pro nihilo aestimo animam meam esse caram mihi $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: nec facio animam meam pretiosiorem quam me *vg.*

xxi. 14 μὴ πειθομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ] non placante autem eo $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: et cum suadere (+ei *vg.*) non possemus $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*

xxvi. 7 ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ] ex tenecitate $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: instanter $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ (*om. vg.*)

There is another theory which might be advanced to explain the relation of $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ to $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and *vg.*, viz. that instead of being posterior to $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and *vg.* (or an intermediate version between $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and *vg.*) it is actually prior to them. This suspicion was first suggested to me by the extraordinary agreement of $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, and Lucifer in xvi. 27 previously noted. Here the arrangement in *E* would easily explain the curious tmesis *experge . . . factus* in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, Luc. The tmesis was, of course, removed by Jerome, who gives *expergefactus*.

The following passage concerns $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ and *vg.*, not $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$:

xxv. 24	omnis	απαν το πληθος
	multitudo	των ιουδαιων
	iudaeorum	ενετυχον μοι
	interpellauerunt mihi	εν τε ιλημ̅
	hierosolymis	και ενθαδε

Here $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ makes two lines out of ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος with the result that there is no equivalent for καὶ ἐνθάδε. The traditional text of the Vulgate (*vg.*^{cl}) has *omnis multitudo Iudaeorum interpellavit me Hierosolymis*, omitting τε and καὶ ἐνθάδε.

The following omission is peculiar to *E* and *vg.*:

xv. 2 καὶ ζητήσεως *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$): *om. E, vg.*

In another case an omission is shared by *AE*, *vg.*:

xxiii. 9 τῶν γραμματέων τοῦ μέρους *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$): *om. AE, vg.*

I add a bolder suggestion which concerns $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$:

viii. 37 ἐὰν πιστεύεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου σωθήσει *E*. $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ renders σωθήσει by *suscepis* (a corruption of *salvus eris*). $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has *si credis ex toto corde hoc.* It is tempting to suppose that *hoc* here stands for *h̄* (*hic*), a common symbol used to indicate a corruption (? *suscepis*) in the text, which may have been subsequently altered to *hoc*.[1]

[1] Blass thinks that *hoc* = 'yes', but does not give instances of this Languedocian form in Latin MSS.

I have thought it well to mention these points, but must add that I consider them inconclusive. I find it impossible to derive 𝔏g from 𝔏e for the simple reason that 𝔏g has frequently preserved a primitive reading where 𝔏e, following *E*, agrees with the ordinary text. A list of such passages has been given earlier in this discussion on p. 269 (3, 4), in all of which 𝔏e (with *E*) agrees with *cett.* A single case may be repeated here. In xx. 4 *E* has Δερβαῖος and is followed by 𝔏e, while 𝔏g has *Doberius*. It is inconceivable that this reading could have been introduced into 𝔏g, if it were derived from 𝔏e. I therefore acquiesce in Jülicher's solution.

With regard to some of the points which have been mentioned a few remarks may be made. The paucity of important differences between 𝔏e and *E* is probably due to the formation of the MS., in which the lines generally consist of one or two words. Under these circumstances discrepancies were not so likely to arise as in the case of longer στίχοι. With regard to the Graecisms, e.g. xvi. 26 *ut moveri* (= ὥστε σαλευθῆναι), these are easily explained by the fact that substantially 𝔏e is an extremely close translation from *E*. The translator used his Latin MS. as an aid to his rendering, and mixed up words and phrases taken from it with his own efforts.

There must be some connexion between 𝔏e and *vg.*cl in the very interesting passage xxv. 24, where τε and καὶ ἐνθάδε are omitted by 𝔏e and *vg*cl. The argument, however, cuts both ways. It is equally easy to suppose that the translator had before him a MS. of the Vulgate, which omitted the words and spaced out the Latin by making two lines out of ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος. If so, this is a clear proof that 𝔏e made use of *vg.* as well as of 𝔏g.

(6) 𝔏^{s} (Vindobonensis) sixth cent.

In connexion with 𝔏^{g} I take 𝔏^{s}. This palimpsest contains portions of chs. xxiii–xxviii. Its text is in basis closely connected with 𝔏^{g}. This may be seen from the following agreements. I give for purposes of comparison the readings of *vg.* and add other agreements in brackets.

xxiv. 22 *περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ*] de hac via 𝔏^{gs} *vg.* (𝔖^{vg}), 23 *διαταξάμενος*] et praecepit 𝔏^{gs} *vg.* (383, 𝔖^{vg}), 25 *καιρῷ δὲ ἐπιτηδείῳ* 𝔏^{gs} *vg.* (*E*, 𝔖^{vg}): *καιρὸν δὲ μεταλαβών cett.*: xxv. 1 *τρεῖς cett.* (*vg.*): *δύο* 𝔏^{gs}: xxvi. 29 *εὐξαίμην ἄν*] opto 𝔏^{gs} *vg.*: xxvii. 17 *ἐχρῶντο*] *ἐχρώμεθα* 𝔏^{gs} (𝔖^{vg}), 19 *εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν* 𝔏^{gs} (614, 𝔖^{ph}, ℭ): *om. cett.* (*vg.*), 21 *μέν cett.* (*vg.*): *μὲν ὑμᾶς* 𝔏^{gs}, 22 *τὰ νῦν cett.* (*vg.*): *τὰ νῦν μέν* 𝔏^{gs}, ib. *ψυχῆς οὐδεμία*] *οὐδεμίας ψυχῆς* 𝔏^{gs} *vg.* (𝔖^{ph}), ib. *πλήν cett.* (*vg.*): *πλὴν μόνον* 𝔏^{gs}, 23 *ἄγγελος ante τοῦ θεοῦ hab.* 𝔏^{gs} *vg.* (𝔖, ℭ), *ante λέγων cett.*, 27 *προσάγειν*] *προσαχεῖν* 𝔏^{gs} (*B*): apparere *vg.*, 28 *εἴκοσι cett.* (*vg.*): + *τὸ βάθος* 𝔏^{gs}, ib. *διαστήσαντες καί cett.* (*vg.*): *om.* 𝔏^{gs}, 32 *τότε cett.* (*vg.*): + *εὐθέως* 𝔏^{gs}: xxviii. 5 *ὁ μὲν οὖν cett.* (*vg.*): *ὁ δὲ Παῦλος* 𝔏^{gs} (𝔖^{vg}), 6 *μέλλειν cett.* (*vg.*): *om.* 𝔏^{gs}, 17 *συνκαλέσασθαι*] *συνεκαλέσατο* 𝔏^{gs} *vg.*, ib. *ἐγώ cett.* (*vg.*): *λέγων* ℵ: *λέγων ἐγώ* 𝔏^{gs}.

The most interesting of these agreements are xxvii. 27 *προσαχεῖν* (*resonare*), where 𝔏^{gs} support *B*, and xxvii. 17 *λέγων ἐγώ*, where 𝔏^{gs} conflate two variants.

I now add cases where they differ:

xxiv. 21 *ἐν αὐτοῖς ἑστώς cett.* (𝔏^{s}): *om.* 𝔏^{g}, ib. *ὑφ' ὑμῶν* ℵ *Eδ*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}: *ἐφ' ὑμῶν ABC*, 𝔏^{s}, 𝔖^{vg}, ℭ, 23 *τηρεῖσθαι cett.* (𝔏^{s}): diligenter custodire 𝔏^{g}, 26 *κατ' ἰδίαν* (secrete) 𝔏^{g}, *Tert.*: *om. cett.* (𝔏^{s}): xxv. 26 *'Αγρίππα cett.* (𝔏^{s}): *om.* 𝔏^{g}: xxvi. 22 *γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν Μωσῇ* 𝔏^{gh}, *Tert*: *καὶ Μωσῆς cett.* (𝔏^{s}): xxvii. 5 *κατὰ τὴν Κνίδον cett.* (𝔏^{g}): *om.* 𝔏^{s}, 13 *ἆσσον cett.* (𝔏^{g}): *"Ασσον* 𝔏^{s} *vg.*, 14 *μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ἔβαλεν κατ' αὐτῆς cett.* (𝔏^{g}): descendit autem 𝔏^{s}, 17 *ἐκπέσωσιν cett.* (𝔏^{s}): *ἐκπέσωμεν* 𝔏^{g}, ib. *τὸ σκεῦος*] *τὰ ἱστία* 𝔏^{s} (𝔖^{vg}): vas quoddam quod traheret 𝔏^{g}, ib. *οὕτως ἐφέροντο*] *ἐφέροντο* 𝔏^{s}, *om.* 𝔏^{g}, 20 *μήτε δὲ ἡλίου . . . ἐπικειμένου cett.* (𝔏^{s}): *χειμῶνός τε . . . ἐπικειμένου ante καὶ μήτε ἡλίου hab.* 𝔏^{g} (𝔖^{vg}), 24 *ὁ θεός cett.* (𝔏^{s}): *om.* 𝔏^{g}, 31 *ὑμεῖς . . . δύνασθε cett.* (𝔏^{s}): *ἡμεῖς . . . δυνάμεθα* 𝔏^{g}, 32 *τῆς σκάφης cett.* (𝔏^{s}): *καὶ τὴν σκάφην* 𝔏^{g}, ib. *καὶ εἴασαν cett.* (𝔏^{s}): *εἴασαν* 𝔏^{g}: xxviii. 19 *ἀλλ' ἵνα . . . θανάτου* 614, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{ph}: *om. cett.* (𝔏^{s}), 21 *πρὸς αὐτόν cett.* (𝔏^{s}): *om.* 𝔏^{g}, ib. *περί cett.* (𝔏^{g}): *κατά* 𝔏^{s} (ℵ, 𝔏^{p}), ib. *τῆς 'Ιουδαίας cett.* (𝔏^{s}): *τῶν 'Ιουδαίων* 𝔏^{g}, ib. *τις cett.* (𝔏^{s}): + *ἀπὸ 'Ιερουσαλήμ* 𝔏^{g} (𝔖^{vg}), ib. *τι cett.* (𝔏^{s}): *om.* 𝔏^{gp}, 22 *πανταχοῦ ἀντιλέγεται cett.* (𝔏^{s}): ubique contradicitur ei in toto orbe 𝔏^{g} (cf. 𝔏^{p}), 24 *τοῖς cett.* (𝔏^{s}): + *ἀπὸ τοῦ Παύλου* 𝔏^{gp}.

It will be seen that 𝔏^{s} agrees with *cett.* in a number of cases where 𝔏^{g} appears to have preserved a *Z* reading. The most noticeable of these are xxiv. 26, xxvi. 22, xxviii. 19. In several cases the reading of 𝔏^{g} is supported by 𝔖^{vg}. The conclusion is irresistible, viz. that the process of expurgation has gone further in 𝔏^{s}, in spite of its early date, than in 𝔏^{g}.[1]

[1] Jülicher says (p. 175) that 𝔏^{s} is the only Latin MS. which has 'mercilessly removed' all *Z* readings from the text.

(7) Λ[s] : g_2 tenth/eleventh cent.

This fragment contains portions of a lesson for the feast of St. Stephen, viz. vi. 8—vii. 2 (*ad ille dixit*) and vii. 51—viii. 4. Its readings agree very closely with those of 𝔏[g], e.g. in vi. 14 (*ἀλλάξει τὰ ἔθη ἃ παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν Μωσῆς*) g_2 agrees with 𝔏[g] in rendering *τὰ ἔθη* by *instar*. (Cf. p. 210.) The only reading of any importance which it contains is in viii. 4, where it has *per civitates et castella* after *ibant* (*διῆλθον*) with *Aug.*[c]. It may be noted that the only passages quoted by Lucifer from this perioche are vii. 50–4 and 57–8. The only variant here which calls for notice is in *v.* 51, where g_2 and Lucifer have the words *καὶ ὑμεῖς* (= *cett.*), which are omitted by 𝔏[gh].

(8) The Vulgate (*vg.*)

The traditional or Clementine edition of the Vulgate (*vg.*^{cl}) has been modified in a number of places by Wordsworth and White in their critical edition (*W*). Some of these differences are important, while others are minute points. The most important cases are:

iv. 21 ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι] id quod factum fuerat in eo quod acciderat *vg.*^{cl}: in eo quod factum erat *W*

v. 15 et liberarentur ab infirmitatibus suis *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W*

viii. 37 dixit autem Philippus: Si credis ex toto corde, licet. Et respondens ait: Credo Filium Dei esse Iesum Christum *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W*

ix. 5 durum est tibi contra stimulum calcitrare *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W*

6 et tremens ac stupens dixit: Domine quid me vis facere? Et Dominus ad eum *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W*

x. 6 hic dicet tibi quid te oporteat facere *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W*

xv. 29 et sanguine et suffocato *vg.*^{cl}: et sanguine [suffocato] *W*

34 visum est autem Silae ibi remanere: Iudas autem solus abiit Ierusalem *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W*

41 praecipiens custodire praecepta Apostolorum et seniorum *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W*

xviii. 4 et disputabat in synagoga per omne sabbatum interponens nomen Domini Iesu, suadebatque Iudaeis et Graecis *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W*

xxiii. 24 timuit enim ne forte raperent eum Iudaei et occiderent, et ipse postea calumniam sustineret tamquam accepturus pecuniam *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W*

xxiv. 6–8 voluimus secundum legem nostram iudicare. Superveniens autem tribunus Lysias cum vi magna eripuit eum de manibus nostris, iubens accusatores eius ad te venire *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W*

xxviii. 29 et cum haec dixisset, exierunt ab eo Iudaei multam habentes inter se quaestionem *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W*

Most of these passages are *Z* readings, present in O.-L. MSS. and found in some MSS. of *vg.*, but omitted by others. They must either have been present in the edition of Jerome and struck out in the course of transmission, or have originally been absent and afterwards introduced from O.-L. MSS. As there is overwhelming evidence that MSS. of *vg.* were systematically interpolated from the O.-L., just as the O.-L. was interpolated from *vg.*, the editors adopt the second solution, which is clearly right.

The primary MSS. on which they rely are *G*, *C*, *A*, *F*, *D*. The last of these is the Book of Armagh, ninth cent., which I discuss later on in this chapter. It seems to me strange that it should be included in the list of first-

class witnesses to Jerome's text, since it is plainly composite in character, uniting a very large number of O.-L. readings with a Vulgate basis. Wherever, therefore, it differs from the other first-class MSS., or has only slight support, it casts light not on Jerome's version, but on the O.-L. which it superseded. It will be found that in most of the passages where the editors depart from *vg.*^{cl} the discarded reading is that of *D*, either alone or with small support.

There are certain points in which I am unable to follow the editors. The chief is in iv. 21 (quoted above). Here the only 'first-class' authority for *in eo quod acciderat* is *D*. The editors (p. v) take this as a case where *D* has preserved the reading of Jerome. It is probably a correction taken from an O.-L. MS. That Jerome was capable of conflating variants will be seen shortly (p. 282).

Another case which I venture to think doubtful is xviii. 4 *et disputabat . . . et Graecis*. Here the authorities are divided. A*FG omit the verse, while A^1CD retain it. It is present in all Greek MSS. (with some variations), and its omission may be a *proprius error* of A*FG.

Minor cases are:

i. 4 inquit *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W* 17 qui *vg.*^{cl}: quia *W* ii. 29 quoniam *vg.*^{cl}: + et *W* iv. 12 aliud nomen est *vg.*^{cl}: nomen aliud est *W* 32 cor unum *vg.*^{cl}: cor *W* vi. 3 sancto *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W* vii. 32 ego sum *vg.*^{cl}: ego *W* 60 in Domino *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W* viii. 4 Dei *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W* x. 48 apud eos *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W* xi. 29 singuli *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W* xiii. 2 Saulum et Barnabam *vg.*^{cl}: Barn. et Saulum *W* xv. 33 aliquanto *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W* xvi. 6 Dei *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W* 29 ad pedes *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W* xviii. 6 sua *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W* 18 totonderat *vg.*^{cl}: totonderant *W* xix. 2 dixerunt *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W* 9 Domini *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W* (*ita v.* 23) xxiii. 18 Paulus *vg.*^{cl}: + vocans *W* 21 amplius quam *vg.*^{cl}: amplius *W* 30 vale *vg.*^{cl}: *om. W* xxv. 18 malum *vg.*^{cl}: malam *W* 24 Hierosolymis petentes et acclamantes *vg.*^{cl}: Hier. petens et hic clamantes *W*

As a rule the readings rejected by *W* occur in *D* (Book of Armagh), with or without support. There are, however, exceptions. e.g.:

xvi. 29 *ad pedes* (= 𝕷^{g}) is found in *ACF*, but omitted by *DG*.

I now mention certain peculiarities of *vg.*:

(*a*) Omissions (agreements are added in brackets):

xv. 2 καὶ ζητήσεως *om. vg.* (*E*, Jerome, *Ep.* 112. 7. 6)

xxii. 12 εὐλαβὴς *om. vg.* (*A*)

xxiii. 9 τῶν γραμματέων τοῦ μέρους *om. vg.* (*AE*)

xxiv. 2 τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ *om. vg.*

xxvi. 7 ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ *om. vg.*

xxvii. 28 καὶ πάλιν βολίσαντες *om. vg.* (𝕾^{vg})

34 τοῦτο γὰρ πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας ὑπάρχει] pro salute vestra *vg.* (𝕾^{vg} *fere*)

xxviii. 17 ἐγένετο *om. vg.*

(*b*) Doublets in *vg.*

The most striking case (iv. 21) has already been quoted. Others are:

xxiv. 17 προσφοράς] oblationes et vota *vg.*

xxvii. 43 ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐξιέναι] et evadere et ad terram exire *vg.*

To these may be added xxv. 24 βοῶντες] petentes et clamantes *vg.*[cl] (petens et hic clamantes *W*).

(*c*) Errors:

On one occasion Jerome appears to have misread the Greek, viz.:

xxvii. 2 ἀνήχθημεν, ὄντος σὺν ἡμῖν Ἀριστάρχου] sustulimus perseverante (= μένοντος) nobiscum Aristarcho.

In xix. 35 καὶ τοῦ διοπετοῦς is mistranslated by *Iovisque prolis* (*et Iovis* 𝔏[g]).

In xxvii. 5 κατήλθαμεν εἰς Μύρα τῆς Λυκίας *vg.* has the impossible variant Λύστραν (= ℵ *A*, 𝔏[g]) for Μύρα. In *v.* 8 for Λασαία it gives *Thalassa* (*Talassa* 𝔏[g]), and in *v.* 13 renders ἄραντες ἆσσον by *cum sustulissent de Asson* (cf. 𝔏[s] *elevantes de Asso*).

The readings which Jerome finally adopted in the Vulgate frequently differ from those which appear in his numerous quotations. The most striking case is in xv. 20 where on Gal. ii, § 478 he quotes the passage without καὶ πνικτῶν, adding '*sive ut in nonnullis exemplaribus scriptum est* et a suffocatis'. In ix. 4, a passage which he quotes three times (Ep. 121. 6. 16, Eccles. 495, Is. xv. 653), he places σκληρόν . . . λακτίζειν after τί με διώκεις; In *vg.*[cl] the words are inserted in *v.* 5 after ὃν σὺ διώκεις with O.-L. MSS. (*om. W*). In viii. 38 he quotes (*c. Lucif.* 178. 182) the longer reading ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐνοῦχον (cf. Is. xvii. 754 *sunt qui angelum in spiritu sancto haec fecisse testentur*).

In ii. 9 he gives up Συρίαν (Is. iv. 163) which, if a conjecture, is a good one, in favour of the meaningless Ἰουδαίαν, and in iv. 6 surrenders Ἰωνάθας (*Nom. Hebr.*), which is undoubtedly right, in favour of Ἰωάννης.

As a striking specimen of differences between a quotation of Jerome and *vg.* I take xix. 1–6, which in *c. Lucif.* 180 is given as follows (important readings are underlined):

1. Factum est autem cum Apollo esset Corinthi et cum Paulus pertransiret superiores partes Asiae devenit Ephesum et cum invenisset quosdam discentes, 2. dixit ad eos: si spiritum sanctum accepistis cum credidistis. At illi <u>responderunt</u>: Sed nec si spiritus sanctus sit audivimus. 3. Dixit autem ad eos: In quo ergo baptizati estis? Responderunt: In Iohannis baptismate. 4. Dixit autem Paulus: Iohannes <u>quidem</u> baptizavit baptismo paenitentiae plebem dicens in advenientem post eum ut crederent, hoc est in Iesum, <u>in remissionem peccatorum.</u> 5. His auditis baptizati sunt in nomine domini nostri Iesu <u>Christi.</u> 6. Et cum imposuisset illis manus Paulus, <u>continuo cecidit</u> spiritus sanctus super eos.

The following variants occur in *vg.*:

xix. 1 et cum] ut pertransiret . . . devenit] peragratis superioribus partibus veniret cum invenisset] inveniret discentes] discipulos

2 dixit] + que cum credidistis] credentes responderunt] ad eum nec] neque sit] est

3 dixit autem ad eos] ille vero ait responderunt] qui dixerunt

4 quidem] *om.* baptismo] baptisma plebem] populum in advenientem] in eum qui venturus esset eum] ipsum in remissionem peccatorum] *om.*

5 nostri Iesu Christi] Iesu

6 continuo] *om.* cecidit] venit

Most of these differences are stylistic and require no comment. The underlined passages are highly interesting, viz.:

v. 2 responderunt *pap. Mich.*: οἱ δὲ πρὸς αὐτόν (*sim.*) *cett.* (*D*)

4 quidem] μέν *E* δ, 𝔖ph : *om. cett.* (*D*)

in remissionem peccatorum (εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν)] These words, which form a στίχος in *D*, are placed here by Ambrose. In *D pap. Mich.* δ, 𝔖ph they come at the end of *v.* 5. A στίχος appears to have got out of place in Ambrose and Jerome.

5 Christi] So *D pap. Mich.* (?) δ, 𝔏g, *alii* : *om.* Γ *E*

6 continuo] εὐθέως *D*: *om. cett.* (*pap. Mich.*)

cecidit] ἐπέπεσεν *D pap. Mich.* : ἦλθεν *cett.*

Mixed MSS. of Vulgate.

I now come to mixed MSS., i.e. Vulgate in basis, but containing a number of readings taken from a *Z* source. Among these I include the Book of Armagh, which I term *vg.*^{a} in order to bring it into line with other contaminated MSS.

The variants of *vg.*^{a} are drawn from several sources. Some are rectifications of small omissions in the Vulgate, e.g. i. 12 εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ] Hierosolymam *vg.*: in Hier. *vg.*^{a}, iv. 20 ἡμεῖς *om. vg.*: nos *vg.*^{a}. Others are variants which occur in some MSS. of the Vulgate (not in *vg.*^{cl} or *W*), e.g. xv. 1 ⟨dicentes⟩, xvii. 19 ⟨non⟩ possumus, xviii. 25 ⟨de⟩ Iesu. Apart from these trivialities we find a number of important agreements with *Z* readings. Most of these are supported by O.-L. MSS., generally including $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$. There are also a number of minute points which show a special connexion between $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and *vg.*^{a}. The probability, therefore, is that a MS. resembling $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ is the fount from which a considerable number of these variants have been taken. There remain certain readings not found in any Latin authority, but agreeing with *D*, *c.Th.*, and *E*.

I give first special agreements of $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and *vg.*^{a}.:

vii. 6 deus ⟨sic⟩ $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*^{a}, 27 ⟨is⟩ autem qui $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*^{a}, ib. proximo ⟨suo⟩ $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*^{a}, 39 reppulerunt ⟨eum⟩ $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*^{a}: xvi. 17 subsecuta ⟨est⟩ $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *vg.*^{a}: xviii. 3 ⟨et salutavit eos⟩ $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*^{a} (*in fine versus*): xxi. 16 ⟨quidam⟩ ex discipulis $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*^{a}, 20 quot milia sunt ⟨hominum⟩ $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*^{a}: xxiii. 1 ⟨in⟩ concilium *vg.*^{a}, *Luc.*: ⟨ad⟩ concilium $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: xxiv. 13 possunt ⟨quicquam⟩ $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*^{a}: xxvi. 6 et iudicor $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: iudicio subiectus *vg.*: et iudicor pro quam iudicio *vg.*^{a} (*conflat.*): xxvii. 9 consolabatur ⟨eos⟩ $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*^{a}, 21 oportebat quidem ⟨vos⟩ $\mathfrak{L}^{gs}$, *vg.*^{a}.

I take separately xxvii. 18–20. In *v.* 18 $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ renders σφοδρῶς δὲ χειμαζομένων ἡμῶν by *vento autem valide instante et tempestate* (*valide autem nobis tempestate iactatis vg.*), while *vg.*^{a} has *permanente autem valde* (*mg. valide*) *autem nobis tempestate iactatis*. The superfluous *autem* after *valde* shows that conflation has taken place. In *v.* 20 $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ inverts the order of the two clauses χειμῶνός τε οὐκ ὀλίγου ἐπικειμένου (*perseverante autem tempestate*) and μήτε ἡλίου μήτε ἄστρων ἐπιφαινόντων ἐπὶ πλείονας ἡμέρας: so also $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$. The writer of *vg.*^{a} was puzzled by this collocation variant and put *permanente autem* into *v.* 18.

I add cases where *D* agrees with $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and *vg.*^{a}.:

xv. 34 μόνος δὲ Ἰούδας ἐπορεύθη *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*^{a}: *om. cett.*

xvi. 6 τοῦ θεοῦ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*^{a}, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.*

xvii. 6 καὶ λέγοντες *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*^{a}: *om. cett.*

ib. εἰσιν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*^{a}, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.*

In certain cases 𝔏^{g} does not agree with *D*, *vg.*^{a}, viz.:

xv. 20 καὶ ὅσα . . . ποιεῖτε *D c.Ath.*, *vg.*^{a}, 𝔈, *Iren.*: *om. cett.* (𝔏^{g})

xvi. 40 διηγήσαντο . . . αὐτοῖς *D*, *vg.*^{a}, *Cass.*: *om. cett.* (𝔏^{g})

xvii. 31 Ἰησοῦ *D*, *vg.*^{a}, *Iren.*: *om. cett.* (𝔏^{g})

It will be noticed that there is patristic evidence for these readings. There are also agreements between *vg.*^{a} and *E* or *DE*, with or without 𝔏^{g}, viz.:

iv. 31 παντὶ τῷ θέλοντι πιστεύειν *DE*, *vg.*^{a}, *Iren.*: *om. cett.* (𝔏^{g})

v. 39 οὔτε ὑμεῖς οὔτε βασιλεῖς οὔτε τύραννοι *D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{ph}: οὔτε ὑμεῖς οὔτε οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν *E*, 𝔏^{g}, *vg.*^{a}: *om. cett.*

vii. 3 συγγενείας σου] + καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρός σου *E*, *vg.*^{a}, *Aug.*

19 ζωογονεῖσθαι] + τὰ ἄρρενα *E*, 𝔏^{g}, *vg.*^{a}

21 παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν *D E*, *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖^{ph}: *om. cett.* (𝔏^{g})

32 ἐγώ] + εἰμι *E*, 𝔏^{dg}, *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖, 𝔈

xix. 9 τὴν ὁδόν] + τοῦ κυρίου *E*, 𝔏^{g}, *vg.*^{a}

The following agreements with *c.Th.* deserve notice:

ii. 41 τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ] + καὶ πιστεύσαντες *c.Th.*, *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug.*

xv. 41 παραδιδοὺς (+ τε *c.Th.*) τὰς ἐντολὰς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων (*ita D*, τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ πρεσβ. *c.Th.*, 𝔏^{g}, *vg.*^{a}) *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{g}, *vg.*^{a}: *om. cett.*

xxii. 7 σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν *c.Th. E*, 𝔏^{g}, *vg.*^{a}, 𝔖^{vg}: *om. cett.* (*D*)

xxv. 24–5 ὅπως παραδῶ . . . φυλάσσεται *c.Th.*, *vg.*^{a} (also *vg.*^{boh}): *om. cett.*

A special point in which *vg.*^{a} differs from other mixed MSS. of *vg.* is that few of its variants appear to be drawn from 𝔏^{p}. The chief cases I have noticed are:

v. 17 ἀναστὰς δέ *cett.* (𝔏^{g}): "Αννας δέ 𝔏^{p}: ἀναστὰς δὲ "Αννας *vg.*^{a}

vi. 2 δώδεκα] ἀπόστολοι 𝔏^{g}: δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι 𝔏^{p}, *vg.*^{a}

Cases in which *vg.*^{a} agrees with 𝔏^{gp} prove nothing.

There are a few agreements between *vg.*^{a} and 𝔏^{p2}, the most striking of which is vii. 2 ἐν Χαρράν] + et inde transmigravit illum in terram Chaldaeorum 𝔏^{p2}, *vg.*^{a} (*ex v.* 4).

S. Berger, in his admirable work *L'Histoire de la Vulgate*, has done much to illuminate the subject of mixed MSS., most of which appear to radiate from the Albigensian districts of France. He says (p. 74), 'Deux pays seulement, à notre connaissance, montrent, en plein moyen âge, un attachement obstiné aux textes antérieurs à saint Jérôme: ce sont les pays albigeois et la Bohème, terres d'hérésie et d'indépendance religieuse autant que de particularisme fier et jaloux'. He describes this type of French text as *Languedocien* or *méridional*, and gives a long, though by no means complete, list of MSS. in which it is to be found.[1] A simple inspection of the variants which he quotes (pp. 81–2) is

[1] Dr. Conybeare possessed a MS. which contained a large number of variants, and drew attention to a MS. of this type belonging to the Soane Library in Lincoln's Inn Fields, London (*Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1921, pp. 36–42). Among those which I have myself examined I would mention *Flor. Naz.* J. x. 1, which once belonged to Niccolò Niccoli, as specially interesting.

sufficient to show that they chiefly emanate from one source, viz. an O.-L. MS. similar to $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$. It is evident that a floating apparatus criticus drawn from this fount was widely circulated, and that selections from it, made more or less capriciously, passed into a great number of Vulgate texts.

In addition to the Languedocian MSS. we have the Provençal version printed by L. Clédat.[1] This is Vulgate in basis, but contains a number of variants found in $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ and the mixed MSS., and may be regarded as a member of the group.

It would not be without interest to collate the chief MSS. of this family, but the results would probably be inconsiderable and the inquiry would go beyond the limits of this work. For present purposes it is sufficient to quote a few representative MSS. I have myself looked at most of the mixed MSS. mentioned by Berger as existing in the Bibliothèque Nationale, and was especially struck by the large number of O.-L. readings which occur in *Lat.* 343, thirteenth century, from Narbonne. I therefore made a collation of it and call it *vg.*^{q}.

The only other MS. which I quote in addition to *vg.*^{a} and *vg.*^{q} is the Wernigerodensis. This MS., which I term *vg.*^{w}, is described by Berger (p. 80) as belonging to the library of Count Stolberg at Wernigerode in the Harz. It was subsequently collated by Blass, who attached great importance to its readings.[2] It contains interlineal glosses in Czech, and was without doubt written in Bohemia early in the fifteenth century.

There can be no doubt that this Bohemian MS. is closely connected with the Languedocian type. Berger says '*il n'y a guère lieu de douter que ce texte dépaysé n'ait été copié en Bohème sur un MS. méridional apporté par un Cathare ou plutôt par un Vaudois*'.[3] It is, however, possible that O.-L. MSS. of the $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ type circulated more widely than is generally supposed, and were to be found in Bohemia as well as in Languedoc. What is certain is that *vg.*^{w} is closely related to $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$. This was demonstrated by Blass,[4] who pointed out a number of errors common to the two MSS. and gives a long list of agreements between *vg.*^{w}, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, and the Provençal translation (= Prov.).

It must not be inferred that the affinities of *vg.*^{w} are exclusively with $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ and its allies. Most of the important variants appear to have been taken from this source, but others from a farrago of miscellaneous variants. They contain a number of readings which agree with $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ or $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ as against $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$.

I now come to what is called the *versio Bohemica*.[5] This was contained in the Leskovec Bible (in Czech) belonging to the Dresden Library (Oe 85). It was first examined by Dobrowsky, who says of it:

> 'Einige Lesarten aus der Böhmischen Uebersetzung habe ich Hrn Griesbach für die zweyte Ausgabe seiner N.T. mitgetheilet, woraus zu ersehen seyn wird, das der Böhmische Uebersetzer einen interpolierten Text vor sich hatte, der

[1] *Le Nouveau Testament traduit au XIII^e siècle en langue provençale* (1887).

[2] *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1896, pp. 436–71.

[3] l.c., p. 80.

[4] *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, i–ii (1896), pp. 436–71.

[5] I have to record my obligations in the following remarks to Prof. Vajs of Prague, to whom Prof. Nevill Forbes wrote on my behalf (in 1921).

in einigen Stellen der jüngern Syrischen version ähnlich ist. Es wäre der Mühe werth, die alte Böhmische Uebersetzung der Apostelgeschichte genauer zu untersuchen und aus ihr alle abweichende Lesarten zu sammeln.'[1]

The notes of Griesbach contain eight references to this version (vi. 10, xi. 17, xv. 7, xx. 26, xxii. 28, xxiv. 24, xxv. 24, xxviii. 31). Tischendorf reprinted these with the exception of xv. 7 and xx. 26, which are trivial variants, but does not refer to Griesbach.[2] Gregory (iii, p. 1128) says, '*Unde Tisch. bohem.*, e.g. *Act. xxv. 24 hauserit nescio*'. This is a surprising statement in view of the fact that on the previous page he refers to the dissertation of Dobrowsky and the Dresden MS. The only explanation seems to be that he omitted to look up his references. The Dresden MS. no longer exists. Shortly before the outbreak of the Great War it was sent to Louvain to be photographed, and perished when the University library was burnt on 4 August 1914.[3]

I entertain no doubt that the Bohemian version resembled the Provençal in giving a mixed text, i.e. that it was based upon the Vulgate, but contained sporadic readings drawn from an O.-L. source. This appears to be implied by the language of Dobrowsky, who speaks of it as an 'interpolated text', which had 'in certain places' received variants from another source. If its basis had been an O.-L. MS. there must have been many more variants for Dobrowsky to quote. As a matter of fact, two of his variants, as previously mentioned, are very unimportant, viz.:

xv. 7 ἐν ὑμῖν Γ, *bohem.*: ἐν (*om. D.*) ἡμῖν *cett.* (*vg.*)
xx. 26 πάντων] + ὑμῶν *E*, *S*, *bohem.*

He would hardly have included these if striking variants were common. I therefore call this version *vg.*boh for purposes of comparison with the mixed MSS. *vg.*aqw.

There is a curious connexion between *vg.*boh and *vg.*a. The most striking case is:

xxii. 28 quam facile civem Romanum te dicis *vg.*a,boh, *c.Bedae* (not *E*): *om. cett.* (*D*)

xxv. 24 Here a very long passage is found in its full form in *c.Th.* only. A considerable portion of it also survives in *vg.*a,boh (*vg.*boh ends before *vg.*a).

In another passage *vg.*boh agrees with *c.Th.* (*sol.*), viz.:

xxiv. 24 ἥτις ἠρώτησεν ἰδεῖν τὸν Παῦλον καὶ ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον (*om.* τὸν λόγον *vg.*boh) *c.Th.*, *vg.*boh

The other passages, vi. 10, xi. 17, xxviii. 31, contain widely diffused *Z* variants. It may be noted that *vg.*a agrees, except in xxviii. 31, where *vg.*boh had *quoniam hic est Christus* (*om.* ὁ υἱός . . . κρίνεσθαι).

[1] *Abhandlung. d. böhm. Gesellschaft*, iii (1798), part 2, pp. 240-66.

[2] Blass, p. xxvi (ed. min.), says, '*Tisch. etiam bohemicam quandam versionem adhibuit, quae ubi gentium exstet neque ipse indicat et socius operis Gregory se nescire fatetur*'.

[3] This information was first given to me by Father Hippolyte Delehaye and subsequently confirmed by Prof. Vajs. As Ropes, who does not mention Louvain, says (p. cxli) that 'the MS. has been injured by fire, but not destroyed', I thought it well to write to the authorities of the Dresden library, and received the reply (from Dr. Benndorf), '*Die HS. ist beim Brande von Löwen leider vollständig zerstört worden.*'

Vocabulary of Old-Latin MSS. and *vg.* in Acts.

As the subject is somewhat complicated, I begin with a brief statement of some facts which have emerged in the course of this discussion.

(1) $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ has peculiar features, and to a certain extent stands by itself.

(2) $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ has affinities with both $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, but the precise character of its relationship with them is not yet established.

(3) $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ is the basis of Jerome's Vulgate.

(4) $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ are composite. In basis they are literal translations of *D* and *E*, but they have received much material drawn from a Latin version which was consulted by the translator. In $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ this version was similar to $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ it was either *vg.* or a missing link between $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and *vg.*

(5) If this is so, it would be natural to expect extensive similarities of vocabulary in $\mathfrak{L}^{deg}$, *vg.*

The statistics for $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ are necessarily scanty, since only a few leaves of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ have survived, and only chs. i–xiii. 6 and xxviii. 16–31 in $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ are drawn from an O.-L. source. I pass over $\mathfrak{L}^{t}$, since it is very fragmentary and portions of it are taken from the Vulgate: also $\mathfrak{L}^{s}$, since this adds nothing to the authority of $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$.

I now apply various tests which throw light upon the inter-relationship of our authorities. Some of them have already been used to show differences between $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ in Evv. and Acts (pp. 206–9). Others are selected as specially useful in the present inquiry.

(*a*) *vero*. (Cf. p. 208.) The register of this word in our authorities for Acts, according to my observations, is:

$\mathfrak{L}^{d}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{e}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{h}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{p}$	*vg.*
80	18	27	0	30	41

The chief point of interest here is the absence of *vero* from $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$. In the other MSS. and *vg.* it is common, especially in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$. It will be remembered that in Evv. $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ avoided the word, except in Mk. (7 exx.) where the translator had by his side an O.-L. MS. similar to $\mathfrak{L}^{bff}$.

(*b*) *-que*. (Cf. p. 208.)

$\mathfrak{L}^{d}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{e}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{h}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{p}$	*vg.*
56	11	40	0	8	42

Here again $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ stands alone in its total avoidance of *-que*. The word is rare not only in $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, which has points of contact with $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, but in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ also. It is common in $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and *vg.*, and commonest in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, which in Evv. avoids *-que* altogether, except in Mk. (4 exx.).

(*c*) Renderings of δόξα and δοξάζω. (Cf. p. 206.)

Both words are somewhat rare in Acts. There are four cases of δόξα.

	$\mathfrak{L}^{d}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{e}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{h}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{p}$	*vg.*
claritas	3	1	1	1	0	1
gloria	1	3	1	0	2	2
honor	0	0	1	1	1	1

There is also one case of *maiestas* in $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$.

The following agreements are noticeable: vii. 2 *claritas* $\mathfrak{L}^{dh}$: xxii. 11 *claritas* $\mathfrak{L}^{deg}$ *vg.* (*def.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$).

δοξάζω. The word occurs five times in Acts, but in one of them (xiii. 48) *D*, followed by $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$, has a variant (ἐδέξαντο for ἐδόξασαν).

	$\mathfrak{L}^{d}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{e}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{h}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{p}$	*vg.*
clarifico	4	0	0	1	0	1
glorifico	0	5	2	0	0	3
honorifico	0	0	1	0	1	0
magnifico	0	0	1	0	2	1

Clarifico is the only rendering in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$. The following agreements are noticeable: iii. 13 *clarifico* $\mathfrak{L}^{dh}$: iv. 21 $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ *vg.*

(*d*) Renderings of ἀρχιερεύς (cf. p. 206):

	$\mathfrak{L}^{d}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{e}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{h}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{p}$	*vg.*
pontifex	6	1	1	2	0	0
princeps sacerdotum	0	21	18	0	10	20
sacerdos	0	0	0	4	0	1

Exceptional renderings are v. 27 *praetor* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ and xxiii. 4 *summus sacerdos vg.* (in Evv. confined to Mk.). In v. 24 $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has *pontifex et princeps sacerdotum*, a combination of variants. In Acts *pontifex* is the only rendering in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ (no example in Evv.). $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ has two exx. of *pontifex*, but prefers *sacerdos*: $\mathfrak{L}^{egp}$ and *vg.* nearly always give *princeps sacerdotum.*

To these examples of ἀρχιερεύς may be added:

iv. 6 ἀρχιερατικοῦ] pontificali $\mathfrak{L}^{dh}$: sacerdotali $\mathfrak{L}^{egp}$ *vg.*

(*e*) Renderings of ἄρα.

The word occurs six times in Acts, but in one of them (vii. 1), where $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ renders by *enim*, it is omitted by $\mathfrak{L}^{dghp}$ *vg.* with Γ, *cett.* The other cases are:

viii. 22 εἰ ἄρα] forte $\mathfrak{L}^{egp}$ *vg.* (*def.* $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$)

xi. 18 ἄρα (+ γε *E* δ)] forsitan $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$: utique $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: itane $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: ergo *vg.*

xii. 18 τί ἄρα] quidnam $\mathfrak{L}^{egp}$ *vg.* (*om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$)

xvii. 27 εἰ ἄρα] forte $\mathfrak{L}^{deg}$ *vg.*

xxi. 38 οὐκ ἄρα (*om.* ἄρα *D*)] nonne $\mathfrak{L}^{deg}$ *vg.*

Apart from xi. 18, the agreements of $\mathfrak{L}^{degp}$ *vg.* are striking.

I have not included in this list the single case of ἆρά γε (viii. 30). Here the renderings vary: *itane* $\mathfrak{L}^{ep}$: *si* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *putasne vg.* (*def.* $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$).

In the preceding list the use of *utique* by $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ in xi. 18 to render ἄρα γε may be noted. The other cases in which I have found *utique* used in MSS. of Acts (and *vg.*) may be mentioned in this connexion, viz.:

= ὅτι, v. 4, $\mathfrak{L}^{dep}$ *om. vg.*: ib. 9 $\mathfrak{L}^{dep}$ *vg.*
= πάντως, xxi. 22 $\mathfrak{L}^{deg}$ *vg.*: xxviii. 4 *vg.* (*om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$).

These coincidences are striking.

(*f*) *nam.*

While in some O.-L. MSS. *nam* is not uncommon, in others it is rare or disappears altogether, *enim* only being used. The register for *nam* in Acts, so far as my observations go, is:

$\mathfrak{L}^{d}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{e}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{h}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{p}$	*vg.*
1	1	5	0	1	2

The most interesting passage is xix. 40, where $\mathfrak{L}^{deg}$ and *vg.* agree in giving *nam* for καὶ γάρ.

It may be mentioned in this connexion that in Evv. the only case of *nam* in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ is in Mk. x. 45, where it equals καὶ γάρ. Here *nam* is also found in $\mathfrak{L}^{b\,ff}$ and other Latin MSS. I now give the figures for $\mathfrak{L}^{b\,ff}$ in Evv., viz.:

	Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.
$\mathfrak{L}^{b}$	8	0	17	3
$\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$	5	1	20	2

It will be seen that *nam* is rare in Mk. (and Jn.). It is therefore singular that the only case of *nam* in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ should be one of the three in $\mathfrak{L}^{b}$ and the two in $\mathfrak{L}^{ff}$.

(*g*) Ablative of the gerund used to render a Greek participle in the nom., e.g. ποιήσας = *faciendo.*

In Evv. this idiom is rare. I have noticed seven examples in various O.-L. MSS., all curiously enough in Lk. (v. 4; vii. 45; x. 25; xii. 25; xv. 13; xviii. 5, 18), in several of which the same idiom is found in a number of MSS.

The figures for Acts are:

$\mathfrak{L}^{d}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{e}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{h}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{p}$	*vg.*
4	1	11	0	0	3

The following agreements are interesting:

x. 33 παραγενόμενος] veniendo $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*
xvi. 16 μαντευομένη] divinando $\mathfrak{L}^{deg}$ *vg.*
xx. 21 διαμαρτυρόμενος] testificando $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$

This use is commonest in $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, and absent from $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$. I have noticed fourteen examples in the Claromontanus (D_2) containing the Pauline Epistles.

(*h*) *ac, atque* (cf. p. 208):

The figures for Acts are:

	$\mathfrak{L}^{d}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{e}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{h}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{p}$	*vg.*
ac	3	8	21	2	7	12
atque	3	3	2	1	0	3

Here $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ appears as the chief patron of *ac.* The following agreements may be noted:

ac ii. 22 $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$: iii. 8 $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$: iv. 5 $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$: v. 14 $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*: viii. 3 $\mathfrak{L}^{egp}$, *vg.*, 6 $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$, 12 $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *vg.*: ix. 2 $\mathfrak{L}^{egp}$, *vg.*, 24 $\mathfrak{L}^{egp}$, *vg.*: xi. 24 $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$: xx. 31 $\mathfrak{L}^{de}$: xxii. 4 $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*: xxvi. 7 $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$, *vg.*, 22 $\mathfrak{L}^{eh}$ (atque *vg.*)

atque xix. 10 $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$, *vg.*, 17 $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$, *vg.*: xx. 21 $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$, *vg.*

(*i*) Renderings of ὅτι (cf. p. 206–7):

	$\mathfrak{L}^{d}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{e}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{h}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{p}$	*vg.*
quoniam	17	35	7	7	13	44
quia	77	78	87	5	35	64
quod	6	6	13	3	3	8

The figures for $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ are given with some reserve. If doubtful cases are accepted, the totals for *quoniam* and *quia* are raised to 10 and 7 respectively.

The only MS. which belongs to the *quoniam* type is $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, but the evidence is somewhat meagre. The others, including *vg.*, belong to the *quia* type, which is most pronounced in $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$. Jerome appears to have revived the use of *quoniam* as an alternative for *quia*, probably from stylistic reasons.

As the *quod* type is rare except in $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, it is interesting to collect passages where *quod* appears in more than one authority. I find the following agreements:

iv. 41 $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$: vi. 1 $\mathfrak{L}^{ehp}$: xvi. 3 $\mathfrak{L}^{de}$ *vg.*, 10 $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ *vg.*, 38 $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$ *vg.*

(*j*) Renderings of the Greek aor. part. nom. (cf. p. 207):

	$\mathfrak{L}^{d}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{e}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{g}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{h}$	$\mathfrak{L}^{p}$	*vg.*
pres. part.	58	246	129	16	96	207
cum + subj.	115	38	100	15	31	95
abl. abs.	29	34	49	4	13	63

The most remarkable feature in these statistics is the predominance of the *cum* type in $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ and its practical equality with the pres. part. type in $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$. It is also to be noticed that it has a high percentage in $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$. On the other hand it is exceptionally low in $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$. The rise of the abl. abs., an elegant construction, in $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and *vg.* is due to their stylistic superiority.

As the number of abl. abs. constructions is not unwieldy I have thought it worth while to make a list of passages where the abl. abs. occurs in more than one authority. I first give an example of general disagreement to show how easily this may arise:

xiv. 14 ἀκούσαντες] cum audisset $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$: audientes $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$: quo audito $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: ubi audierunt *vg.*

Against such cases of disagreement the following agreements may be set:

ii. 24 $\mathfrak{L}^{dgp}$, *vg.* (*sim.*), 33 $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *vg.*, 41 $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$: iii. 7 $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *vg.*: iv. 13 $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, *vg.*: vii. 24 $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *vg.*, 60 $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*: ix. 40 $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, *vg.*: x. 24 $\mathfrak{L}^{degp}$, *vg.*: xi. 18 $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*: xii. 20 $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$, *vg.*, 25 $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$, *vg.*, ib. $\mathfrak{L}^{degp}$, *vg.*: xiii. 22 $\mathfrak{L}^{deg}$, *vg.*, 51 $\mathfrak{L}^{deg}$, *vg.*: xiv. 19 $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*: xv. 39 $\mathfrak{L}^{deg}$, *vg.*: xvi. 22 $\mathfrak{L}^{deg}$, *vg.*: xvii. 5 $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, ib. $\mathfrak{L}^{deg}$, 15 $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$, *vg.*: xviii. 18 $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$: xix. 5 $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*, 19 $\mathfrak{L}^{deg}$, *vg.*, 28 $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*, 29 $\mathfrak{L}^{e}$, *vg.*:

xx. 1 $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$, *vg.*, 36 $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$, *vg.* : xxi. 4 $\mathfrak{L}^{deg}$, *vg.*, 5 $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *vg.*, 7 $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$, *vg.*, ib. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*, 26 $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*, 32 $\mathfrak{L}^{deg}$, *vg.* : xxii. 26 $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.* : xxiii. 23 $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.*, 32 $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$, *vg.* : xxvi. 1 $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$, *vg.*, 10 $\mathfrak{L}^{eg}$, *vg.* : xxvii. 35 $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.* : xxviii. 14 $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *vg.* (41 exx.).

I have employed a number of other tests which produce similar results, but abstain from producing further details here, and will conclude with a quotation from Jülicher, who says (p. 186):

'Aber wenn in ganzen Versreihen *Vulg. gig. d*, oder obendrein *s, e*, wenn sie so gar noch mit *p* und *h* (ausser in Kleinigkeiten) denselben Wortlaut bieten, so wage ich das nicht mehr dem Zufall zuzuschreiben.'

SYRIAC VERSIONS

(1) OLD-SYRIAC.

It has already been remarked (p. xvii) that we are almost entirely dependent upon the quotations of Ephrem (+373) for our knowledge of an Old-Syriac version of Acts, corresponding to the Old-Syriac version of Evv. which is represented by the Cureton (𝕾ᶜ) and Sinaitic (𝕾ˢ) MSS. Until recently the material was scanty, consisting of a few quotations scattered about the numerous works of the author. They were, however, sufficient to show that the text which he employed was of a strongly marked *Z* type. This was clear from e.g. his quotation of Acts i. 5 (on *Ephes.* iv. 10) *quam recipitis vos non post multos dies sed usque ad Pentecostem*, in agreement with *D*, 𝕷^gt, *Aug.* and other Fathers.

The situation is now changed owing to the acuteness and industry of the late Dr. F. C. Conybeare, the well-known Armenian scholar.[1] When studying an Armenian Catena on Acts, published in 1839 by the Mechitarist Fathers of San Lazzaro in Venice, he found in it a considerable number of notes ascribed to Ephrem mingled with other notes assigned to Chrysostom. He collected the excerpts from Ephrem, and communicated the results to Dr. Rendel Harris, who in some lectures given in 1894 drew attention to the very remarkable agreements between Ephrem's text and *D*.[2] Conybeare himself published a fuller study of the Catena in 1896.[3] Since that time he never lost interest in the subject, and did much work upon the Greek text of the commentary on Acts attributed to Chrysostom, in which there is a good deal of matter probably derived from Ephrem. He had for a long time cherished the hope that a copy of Ephrem's commentary on Acts might come to light, and a few years before his death it occurred to him that a MS. which he knew to be in the Mechitarist convent at Vienna (no. 571) might possibly contain the lost work. He accordingly wrote to Vienna for details, and had the singular gratification of finding that his divination was correct. He then obtained a full collation, the results of which are published in a contribution which he made to Ropes's edition, pp. 373–453. His rough copy he gave to me.

I have thought it worth while to make a list of passages which show the relation of Ephrem's MS. to other authorities.

(*a*) Ephrem = *D*, *alii*.

i. 2 καὶ ἐκέλευσεν κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον *D c.Th.*, 𝕷^gt, 𝕰, *Tert. Aug.*^abc *Ephr.* : *om. cett.*

5 ἕως τῆς πεντηκοστῆς *D*, 𝕰, *Aug.*^ab *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (στ.)

[1] Dr. Conybeare was an old and dear friend of mine. He constantly informed me of his discoveries, while I always communicated to him the results to which my own studies were leading me.

[2] *Four Lectures on the Western Text of the New Testament*, 1894.

[3] *Am. J. of Phil.* xvii (1896), pp. 135–71.

ii. 16 *προφήτου D, Iren. Aug.* : + Ἰωήλ *cett.* Ephr. in his commentary has *de ore Ioel prophetae*, but in the Catena gives the explanation that the reference is to Joel, thus showing that the name was not in the text.

24 *Ἅδου D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gpt}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Iren. Aug. Ephr.* : *θανάτου cett.*

37 *τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν D, Ephr.* : *om. cett.*

iii. 13 *αὐτὸν θέλοντος D, Iren. Ephr.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *sec. Buch.*) : *om. cett.*

17 *ἐπιστάμεθα D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Ephr.* : *οἶδα cett., Iren.*

iv. 31 *παντὶ τῷ θέλοντι πιστεύειν DE, Iren. Aug. Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (*στ.*)

vii. 4 *καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν* (*sim.*) *DE*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: cf. *Ephr.* coepit repetere illis ab Abraham cum ceteris patriarchis : *om. cett.*

x. 41 *ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, 𝔈, *Aug. Ephr.* : *om. cett., Iren.*

xii. 23 *καὶ καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος D, Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (*στ.*)

xiii. 12 *ἐθαύμασεν καί DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.*

50 *θλῖψιν μεγάλην καί DE, Ephr.* : *om. cett.*

xiv. 2 *κατὰ τῶν δικαίων D, Ephr.* : *om. cett.*

12 *οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Ephr.* : *ὅ τε ἱερεύς cett.*

19 *Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπὸ Ἰκονίου καὶ Ἀντιοχείας D c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Ephr.* : *ἀπὸ Ἀντ. καὶ Ἰκον. Ἰουδαῖοι cett.*

xv. 2 *ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος μένειν οὕτως καθὼς ἐπίστευσαν D c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.*

οἱ δὲ ἐληλυθότες ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ D c.Th., Ephr. : *om. cett.* (*στ.*)

7 *ἐν πνεύματι D c.Th.* 614, *Tert. Ephr.* : *om. cett.*

12 *συγκατατιθεμένων δὲ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Πέτρου εἰρημένοις D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (2 *στ.*)

20 *αἵματος D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Iren. Ephr.* : + *καὶ τοῦ πνικτοῦ cett.*

23 *ἐπιστολήν D c.Th.* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, 𝔈, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.*

29 *αἵματος D c.Ath., Iren. Tert. Aug. Ephr.* : + *καὶ πνικτῶν cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι ἑτέρῳ μὴ ποιεῖν D c.Ath., Iren. Tert. Aug. Ephr. : *om. cett.* (2 *στ.*)

φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι D c.Ath., Iren. Tert. Ephr. : *om. cett.*

34 *ἔδοξεν δὲ τῷ Σιλᾷ ἐπιμεῖναι αὐτοῦ DC* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, 𝔖, 𝔈, *Ephr.* : *om.* ℵ *ABE*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ (*στ.*)

ib. *μόνος δὲ Ἰούδας ἐπορεύθη D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (*στ.*)

xvi. 4 *ἐκήρυσσον* (+ *καὶ παρεδίδοσαν αὐτοῖς D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$) *D c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Ephr.* : *παρεδίδοσαν αὐτοῖς cett.*

6 *μηδενί D, Ephr.* : omnino $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *om. cett.*

9 *ὡσεί D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, 𝔈, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.*

35 *καὶ ἀναμνησθέντες τὸν σεισμὸν τὸν γεγονότα ἐφοβήθησαν D c.Th., Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (2 *στ.*)

39 *ἠγνοήσαμεν τὰ καθ᾽ ὑμᾶς ὅτι ἐστὲ ἄνδρες δίκαιοι D* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (2 *στ.*)

xvi. 39 *ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης ἐξέλθατε μήποτε πάλιν συστραφῶσιν ἡμῖν οἱ ἐπικράζοντες καθ' ὑμῶν D δ*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (3 *στ.*)

xvii. 15 *παρῆλθεν δὲ τὴν Θεσσαλίαν· ἐκωλύθη γὰρ εἰς αὐτοὺς κηρῦξαι τὸν λόγον D*, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (3 *στ.*)

26 *αἵματος DE* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}$, *Iren. Aug. Ephr.* : *om.* Γ, *vg.*, $\mathfrak{E}$

xviii. 15 *ἔχετε D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Ephr.* : *ἐστιν cett.*

17 *οἱ Ἕλληνες D cett.*, *Aug. Ephr.* : *om.* Γ, *vg.*

ib. *τότε ὁ Γαλλίων προσεποιεῖτο μὴ ἰδεῖν* $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ (*D eras.*), $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Ephr.* : *καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων τῷ Γαλλίωνι ἔμελεν cett.*

xix. 1 *θέλοντος δὲ τοῦ Παύλου κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν βουλὴν πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν D c.Th. pap. Mich.*, *Ephr.* : *ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν Ἀπόλλω εἶναι ἐν Κορίνθῳ Παῦλον cett.*

14 *παραγγέλλομέν σοι ἐν Ἰησοῦ ὃν Παῦλος κηρύσσει ἐξελθεῖν D c.Th. pap. Mich.*, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (2 *στ.*)

35 *ἡμετέραν D*, *Ephr.* : *Ἐφεσίων cett.*

38 *οὗτος D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.*

xx. 3 *εἶπεν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῷ ὑποστρέφειν D c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Ephr.* : *ἐγένετο γνώμης τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν cett.*

23 *ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.*

24 *τοῦ λόγου ὃν D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ *vg.*, *Ephr.* : *ἣν cett.*

ib. *Ἰουδαίοις καὶ Ἕλλησιν D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.*

(*b*) Ephr. = $\mathfrak{L}^{codd}$.

vii. 58 *καὶ οἱ*] + *ψευδεῖς* $\mathfrak{L}^{gpt}$, *Ephr.*

ix. 4 *μετὰ μεγάλης ἐκστάσεως* (*sim.*) $\mathfrak{L}^{hpt}$, *Amb. Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (*def. D*)

6 *ὁ δὲ τρέμων καὶ θαμβῶν* (*sim.*) $\mathfrak{L}^{hpt}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Aug. Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (*def. D*)

8 *καὶ ἐγειράντων αὐτόν* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (*def. D*)

x. 41 *ἀναστῆναι*] + *καὶ ἀναβῆναι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν* $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, *Ephr.*

xiv. 5 *ὑβρίσαι καὶ λιθοβολῆσαι*] iniuriaverunt et lapidaverunt $\mathfrak{L}^{dh}$, *Ephr.*

16 *ἔθνη*] + *ἀνθρώπων* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Ephr.*

20 *ἑσπέρας γενομένης* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (*D*)

xviii. 8 *πολλοί*] *πολὺς ὄχλος* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Ephr.*

xix. 6 *ὥστε καὶ ἑρμηνεύειν αὐτὰς ἑαυτοῖς c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (*D*)

We may compare viii. 39, where the words *ἅγιον* (*κυρίου* $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$) . . . *ἄγγελος δέ* are found in $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, as well as in *A* (m. 1 *in ras.*), $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Aug. Ephr.*

(*c*) Ephr. = *E*, δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$.

iv. 17 *ἀπειλῇ E* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (*D*)

xv. 6 *σὺν τῷ πλήθει* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (*D*)

36 *ἤρεσεν δὲ ἡ βουλὴ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ* $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (*D*)

xvii. 11 *καθὼς Παῦλος ἀπαγγέλλει* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (*D*)

(*d*) Ephr. = Iren.

xv. 19 ἐγώ] + τὸ κατ' ἐμέ *Iren.* Conybeare inserts this in a lacuna of Ephrem's commentary from *Arm.*[cat], where it is found. As the Catena is closely following the commentary, the supplement seems to be justified.

(*e*) Ephr. = Aug.

i. 18 καὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ *Aug.*[b]: *om. cett.* (*D*). Ephr. *ad Diatess.* (p. 240, Mösinger) has *Et iniecit sibi laqueum. Utque laqueus abscissus est, cecidit ille et crepuit medius.*

iii. 14 ἐβαρύνατε *D*: adgravastis *Iren.*: onerastis et negastis *Aug.*: sprevistis et negastis *Ephr.*

(*f*) Ephr. = Γ.

ii. 22 δεδοκιμασμένον *D*, 𝔏[pt] *vg.*, 𝔖[ph], *Iren. Aug.*: ἀποδεδειγμένον *cett.* Ephrem has *hunc ait qui definitus separatus fuit.*

xviii. 19 Ephrem has no trace of τῷ ἐπιόντι σαββάτῳ (*D*, 𝔏[h], 𝔖[ph], 𝔈), but renders ἐκείνους κατέλιπεν ἐκεῖ with Γ, *cett.*

(*g*) Ephrem has a peculiar reading.

The chief case is xix. 16 κυριεύσας ἀμφοτέρων. Here the commentary has *stridit dentibus daemonium illud ad rectam et sinistram.* In the Catena it is said that the demon 'mutilated' them on the right and on the left; Conybeare suggests that Ephrem had a reading ἀκρωτηριάσας ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων. He may, however, have taken ἀμφοτέρων to mean 'on both sides'.

The following passages, which in the Catena occur amid matter ascribed to Chrysostom, are referred to Ephrem by Conybeare:

ii. 12 ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι *D c.Th.*, *Aug.*[a], *Cat.*: *om. cett.*

vii. 21 παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν *DE*, 𝔖[ph], *Cat.*: *om. cett.*

viii. 1 οἳ ἔμειναν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ *D*, 𝔏[gh], 𝔈, *Cat.*: *om. cett.* (στ.)

24 ὃς πολλὰ κλαίων οὐ διελίμπανεν *D c.Th.*, *Tert.*, *Cat.*: *om. cett.* (στ.)

In certain cases the evidence does not seem sufficient to show that Ephrem supports *D* variants, as is supposed by Conybeare, e.g.:

v. 21 ἐγερθέντες τὸ πρωΐ: vi. 10 διὰ τὸ ἐλέγχεσθαι κ.τ.λ., 15 ἑστῶτος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν: viii. 24 τούτων τῶν κακῶν: xvi. 35 οὓς ἐχθὲς παρέλαβες: xix. 12 ἐπιφέρεσθαι: xxv. 6 ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Φῆστος ἀχθῆναι τὸν Παῦλον.

(2) THE PESHITTO ($\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$).

At one time this version was supposed to go back to the second century A.D. Of recent years, however, Syriac scholars have put its origin much later. This is due to the discovery of the Old-Syriac MSS. $\mathfrak{S}^{c}$ and $\mathfrak{S}^{s}$, and to the recovery of Tatian s Harmony of Evv. (the Diatessaron). Professor Burkitt, in particular, has shown that the Gospel quotations of Ephrem and other early Syrian Fathers are taken not from the Peshitto, as had previously been supposed, but from one or other of these sources.[1] Quotations from the Peshitto are said to occur first in the early part of the fifth century. The presumption, therefore, is that this version came into existence at about this date. He accordingly suggested that it was made by order of Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa from 411 to 435.

With regard to Rabbula in this connexion we have two texts to deal with. The first comes from Rabbula himself, who in his Canons says: 'Let the priests and the deacons have a care that in all the churches a copy of the *Evangeliôn da-Mepharreshe* shall be kept and read.'[2] The second comes from his biographer, apparently a contemporary, who says definitely: 'Now he translated in the wisdom of God that was in him the New Testament from Greek into Syriac, because of its variations, exactly as it was.'[3] Burkitt, therefore, supposes that this version was that which Rabbula ordered to be placed in the Syrian churches.

Those readers who refer to Burkitt's statement of the case will find that he was conscious of certain difficulties.[4] Two of these he points out himself, and attempts to deal with, viz.: (1) The Peshitto Canon did not include the four minor Catholic Epistles or the Apocalypse, and it may seem curious that this was possible at so late a date; (2) How came the Nestorians to accept a work issued under the sanction of Rabbula, the 'tyrant of Edessa'? There is a third difficulty discussed by Burkitt further on (p. 177), viz. that *Mepharreshe* is the term used for the Old-Syriac version. Could Rabbula use it for the Peshitto? Burkitt's solution is that Rabbula desired above all to suppress the Diatessaron, while the Old-Syriac had fallen into abeyance. He, therefore, was free to call his new version, as opposed to the Diatessaron, by the name which properly belonged to the old.

I. do not presume to criticize a theory which has received so much laudation, but I may remark that recent writers, who accept it as proved, do not mention the difficulties of which its author was conscious. It is certainly strange that the Nestorians should have adopted a text issued under the auspices of Rabbula. The silence of Bar-Hebraeus seems to imply that the name of the author was not known to him. It may be remarked that Theodorus of Mopsuestia, predecessor of Rabbula in the see of Edessa, speaks of the Syriac version of the O.T. as of unknown authorship.[5]

The style of the Peshitto is much praised by Syriac scholars on account of its literary qualities. It is said to be free and idiomatic in character, without

[1] *Evangeliôn da-Mepharreshe*, ii, pp. 112–49. [2] Ib., p. 177.
[3] Ib., p. 161. [4] Ib., pp. 164–5.
[5] ἡρμήνευται δὲ ταῦτα εἰς μὲν τὴν τῶν Σύρων παρ' ὅτου δήποτε, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔγνωσται μέχρι τῆς τήμερον ὅστις ποτὲ οὗτος ἐστίν (Migne, lxvi, p. 452, § 252).

any painful attempt to render the Greek with minute accuracy regardless of style. On the other hand its value for critical purposes is diminished by loose renderings, amplifications, transpositions, and blunders.

Pleonastic readings are frequent, e.g.:

v. 38 *καταλυθήσεται*] dissolventur et cessabunt

vi. 12 *ἐπιστάντες*] venerunt et insurrexerunt

vii. 6 *ἐλάλησεν δὲ οὕτως ὁ θεὸς πρὸς αὐτόν*] locutus fuerat cum eo deus cum diceret ei

viii. 6 *προσεῖχον*] attendebant ei et acquiescebant

xiii. 17 *καὶ τὸν λαὸν ὕψωσεν*] et extulit crescere fecit eos

xiv. 6 *κατέφυγον*] discesserunt et confugerunt

A somewhat curious case occurs in iii. 16 *ἐστερέωσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*] confirmavit et sanavit 𝕾vg. Here the addition of *sanavit* has led to the omission of *τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*.

Sometimes variants are conflated, e.g.:

vii. 17 *ἐπηγγείλατο D c.Th. E*, 𝕷p: *ὡμολόγησεν* Γ: *ὤμοσεν* δ, 𝕷g, 𝕾ph: pollicitus fuerat iuramento 𝕾vg

xvi. 13 *πύλης*] *πόλεως E* δ, 𝕾ph: *πύλης πόλεως* 𝕾vg

xvii. 5 *ἐξαγαγεῖν D*: *προαγαγεῖν* (*προσ. E* 614) *cett.*: *ἐξαγαγεῖν καὶ προσαγαγεῖν* 𝕾vg

xix. 25 *τεχνίτας D*: *ἐργάτας* Γ *E* δ: *ἐργάτας καὶ συντεχνίτας* 𝕾vg

Agreements with *D*.

Although 𝕾vg is a mixed text, it shows in places clear evidence of a close connexion with *D*. The most interesting cases are:

xix. 27 Here an ancestor of *D* appears to have had:

και καθαιρεισθαι μελλει
[*η μεγαλειοτης αυτης ην*] *ολη η ασια*
και η οικουμενη σεβεται

D omits the words bracketed and joins *ολη η ασια* with the previous *στίχος*. 𝕾vg has:

Et etiam ipsa dea totius Asiae et quam omnes gentes adorant spernetur.

Here the words *ἡ μεγ. αὐτῆς* are similarly omitted.

xx. 11–13. In *v.* 13 *D* has:

ουτως γαρ ην διατεταγμενος
ως μελλων αυτος πεζευειν

𝕾vg renders *στ.* 2 by *cum proficisceretur ipse per aridam*, and in *v.* 11 after the *στίχος*

αχρις αυγης ουτως εξηλθεν

inserts, absurdly, *ut proficisceretur per aridam*.

These readings seem to be due to an ancestor arranged in *στίχοι* similar to those found in *D*. Other examples pointing to the same conclusion are:

x. 38–9 Here Γ, *cett.* have ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡμεῖς μάρτυρες πάντων ὧν ἐποίησεν κ.τ.λ.

D gives:

οτι ο θεος ην μετ αυτου
και ημεις μαρτυρες αυτου
ων εποιησεν

Here αὐτοῦ in στ. 2 is a *proprius error* of *D* due to αὐτοῦ in στ. 1. 𝔖vg conflates αὐτοῦ and πάντων.

xv. 32 *D* gives:

ιουδας δε και σειλας και αυτοι προφηται
οντες πληρεις πνς αγιου
δια λογου παρεκαλεσαν τους αδελφους
και επεστηριξαν

𝔖vg has:

sermone quoque copioso corroboraverunt fratres et confirmaverunt eos socii Iudae et Silae, quippe qui et ipsi prophetae essent

Here στ. 3–4 are inserted before στ. 1, with consequential botching.

A specially noteworthy agreement between *D* and 𝔖vg is in xvi. 38, where *D* has:

τα ρηματα ταυτα
τα ρηθεντα προς τους στρατηγους

Here τὰ ῥηθέντα appears to be a variant for τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα (Γ, *cett.*). 𝔖vg has *sermones illos qui dicti fuerant sibi.*

In view of this evidence certain cases in which omissions of 𝔖vg correspond to στ. in *D* are significant, viz.:

xii. 10 την φερουσαν εις την πολιν *om.* 𝔖vg (στ.)

xiii. 42 τω Παυλω και Βαρναβα *om.* 𝔖vg (στ.)

xviii. 6 το αιμα υμων επι την κεφαλην υμων *om.* 𝔖vg (στ.)

xxi. 22 τι ουν εστιν παντως *om.* 𝔖vg (στ.)

xxii. 17 fieri me in soporem 𝔏d (*def. D*): *om.* 𝔖vg (στ.)

To these examples I add the following list of minor agreements:

ii. 1 ὄντων αὐτῶν πάντων *D*, 𝔖vg: ἦσαν πάντες *cett.*

iii. 11 θαμβηθέντες (+ἔκθαμβοι *post* Σολομ.) *D*: accurrit totus populus mirabundus ad eos ad porticum quae vocatur Salamonis 𝔖vg: ἔκθαμβοι *post* Σολομ. *cett.*

iv. 5 συνήχθησαν οἱ ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ γραμματεῖς *D*, 𝔏h, 𝔖vg: συναχθῆναι τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους καὶ τοὺς γραμματεῖς *cett.*

v. 10 συστείλαντες *D*, 𝔖vg: *om. cett.*

19 τότε διὰ νυκτὸς ἄγγελος κυρίου *D*, 𝔖vg: ἄγγελος δὲ κυρίου διὰ νυκτός *cett.*

26 ἤγαγον *D*, 𝔖vg: ἦγεν (ἤγαγεν) *cett.*

vi. 2 πρὸς αὐτούς *D*, 𝔏h, 𝔖vg, 𝔈: *om. cett.*

vii. 30 αὐτῷ (+ἐκεῖ 𝔖vg) *D*, 𝔖vg: *om. cett.*

viii. 6 *ὡς δὲ ἤκουον D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.*

x. 22 *πρὸς αὐτόν D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.*

23 *εἰσαγαγών D*, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{vg} : *εἰσκαλεσάμενος cett.*

46 *εἶπεν δέ D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *τότε ἀπεκρίθη cett.*

xi. 1 *ἀκουστὸν δὲ ἐγένετο D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *ἤκουσαν δέ cett.*

xii. 1 *ἐπέβαλεν τὰς χεῖρας Ἡρ. ὁ βασιλεύς D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *ἐπέβαλεν Ἡρ. βασιλεὺς τὰς χεῖρας cett.*

5 *περὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πρὸς τὸν θεόν* (*+περὶ αὐτοῦ D*) *D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλ. πρὸς τὸν θεὸν περὶ αὐτοῦ cett.*

15 *τυχόν D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.*

xiv. 9 *ἀτενίσας δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Παῦλος D*, 𝔖^{vg} (cf. *E*, 𝔏^{h}) : *ὃς ἀτενίσας αὐτῷ cett.*

21 *τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει D*, 𝔏^{gh}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : *τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην cett.*

xvi. 4 *ἐκήρυσσον αὐτοῖς*] *ἐκήρυσσον καὶ παρεδίδοσαν αὐτοῖς D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *κηρύσσοντες c.Th.* : *παρεδίδοσαν αὐτοῖς cett.*

Here *D* and 𝔖^{vg} have the same conflation.

xvi. 9 *ἐν ὁράματι D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *ὅραμα cett.*

12 *κεφαλή D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *πρώτη cett.*

22 *τότε D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *καί cett.*

xvi. 37 *D* has:

αναιτειους δειραντες ημας δημοσια
ακατακριτους ανθρωπους

Here *ἀναιτίους* and *ἀκατακρίτους* (Γ) are variants which have been combined in *D*. 𝔖^{vg} has *ἀναιτίους* in the same place as *D*, but omits *ἀκατακρ.*, while 𝔈 puts it after *ἀνθρώπους Ῥωμαίους*, also omitting *ἀκατακρ.*

xvii. 13 *λόγος θεοῦ κατηγγέλη εἰς Βέροιαν D*, 𝔖^{vg} (*+ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου post κατηγγ.* 𝔖^{vg}) : *καὶ ἐν τῇ Βεροίᾳ κατηγγέλη ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ cett.* 𝔖^{vg} keeps the collocation of *D*, but adds *ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου* from Γ, *cett.*

xviii. 6 *αὐτοῦ D*, 𝔏^{gh}, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.*

11 *ἐν Κορίνθῳ D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖 : *ἐκεῖ* 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

ib. *διδάσκων αὐτούς D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *διδάσκων ἐν αὐτοῖς cett.*

xix. 9 *τινὲς μὲν οὖν D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *ὡς δέ τινες cett.*

ib. *ὁ Παῦλος D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.*

24 *τις ἦν D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *τις* 𝔏^{dg} : *τις ὀνόματι cett.*

25 *πρὸς αὐτούς D*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

26 *ἀκούετε καὶ θεωρεῖτε D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *θεωρ. καὶ ἀκούετε cett.*

38 *οὗτος D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.*

xx. 20 *τοῦ ἀναγγεῖλαι D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι cett.*

ib. *διδάξαι D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *διδάξαι ὑμᾶς cett.*

34 *χεῖρές μου D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *χεῖρες αὗται cett.*

xxi. 5 viam nostram 𝔏^{d} (*def. D*) : in itinere nostro 𝔖^{vg}, *om. cett.*

39 *ἐν Ταρσῷ δὲ τῆς Κιλικίας γεγεννημένος D*, 𝔖^{vg} : *Ταρσεὺς τῆς Κιλικίας cett.*

40 πρὸς αὐτούς *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: τῷ λαῷ *cett.*

xxii. 2 ἡσύχασαν *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: παρέσχον ἡσυχίαν *cett.*

13 καὶ ἐπιστάς *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ (*def. D*), $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

Agreements with *E*.

v. 9 ὁ δὲ Πέτρος πρὸς αὐτήν] εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος *E*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

12 ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ] + συνηγμένοι *E* : $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ has *congregabantur* without ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ

21 ἀκούσαντες δέ] ἐξελθόντες δὲ ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς *E* : et egressi sunt $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

24 διηπόρουν] ἐθαύμαζον καὶ διηπόρουν *E*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

vii. 4 αὐτόν] + ὁ θεός *E*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

8 Ἰσαάκ] + ἐγέννησεν *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

52 νῦν] *om. E*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

xv. 10 νῦν] καὶ νῦν *E*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Tert.*

xvii. 15 ἐντολήν] ἐπιστολήν *E*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

$\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ = Latin MSS., especially $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$.

$\mathfrak{S}^{vg} = \mathfrak{L}^{gh}$.

xviii. 18 ἔτι *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

ib. προσμείνας] + ἐκεῖ $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

ib. τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἀποταξάμενος] ἀπετάξατο τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{S}$

xxiii. 10 γενομένης] + ἐν αὐτοῖς $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

14 τὸ καθόλου $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ (*ante* ἀναθέματι $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$) : *om. cett.*

22 μηδενὶ ἐκλαλῆσαι] ὅπως μηδεὶς εἰδῇ $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

xxvii. 2 ἀρξάμενοι δὲ τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.*

$\mathfrak{S}^{vg} = \mathfrak{L}^{g}$.

vi. 10 ᾧ ἐλάλει] ὃ ἐλάλει $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

vii. 26 μαχομένοις] + πρὸς ἀλλήλους $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

viii. 13 ἐξίστατο] stupens admirabatur eis $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: attonitus fiebat et mirabatur $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ seem to conflate variants)

xiv. 4 πλῆθος] ὅλον τὸ πλῆθος $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

xvii. 18 οἱ δέ] + ἔλεγον $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

xix. 26 σχεδόν] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

xxi. 1 καὶ ἐπιβάντες ἀνήχθημεν *D* : ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο ἀναχθῆναι ἡμᾶς *cett.* : *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

7 ἡμέραν μίαν παρ' αὐτοῖς] παρ' αὐτοῖς ἡμ. μίαν $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

11 ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι] οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐν Ἱερ. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

8 εἰσῄει ὁ Παῦλος σὺν ἡμῖν] εἰσήλθομεν σὺν τῷ Παύλῳ $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

19 διηγεῖτο] + ὁ Παῦλος $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

22 ἐλήλυθας] + ἐνθάδε $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

28 κράζοντες] + καὶ λέγοντες $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}^{vt}$

xxi. 33 *τότε*] *καί* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

xxii. 1 *νυνί*] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

12 *κατοικούντων*] + *ἐκεῖ* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

xxiii. 2 *αὐτοῦ*] *τοῦ Παύλου* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

xxv. 17 *συνελθόντων οὖν αὐτῶν ἐνθάδε*] cum itaque huc venisset $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: et cum venissem huc $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

18 *ὧν*] *ὡς* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

xxvii. 20 *μήτε δὲ ἡλίου μήτε ἄστρων ἐπιφαινόντων ἐπὶ πλείονας ἡμέρας, χειμῶνός τε οὐκ ὀλίγου ἐπικειμένου*] perseverante autem tempestate et neque sole neque stellis apparente per plurimos dies $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *sic fere* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

30 *ἐκτείνειν*] + ut tutius navis staret $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: + et ligaturi navem in terra $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

33 *σήμερον ἡμέραν προσδοκῶντες ἄσιτοι διατελεῖτε μηδὲν προσλαβόμενοι*] dies est hodie a qua sine cibo manetis $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ (*fere*)

36 *καὶ αὐτοί*] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

39 *ἐγένετο*] + *οἱ ναῦται* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$

43 *βουλόμενος διασῶσαι τὸν Παῦλον ἐκώλυσεν αὐτοὺς τοῦ βουλήματος*] prohibuit hoc fieri, praecipue propter Paulum, ut salvum illum faceret $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: prohibuit eos ab hac re, quia volebat servare Paulum $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

44 *ἐγένετο*] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

xxviii. 1 *διασωθέντες*] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

5 *ὁ μὲν οὖν*] *ὁ δὲ Παῦλος* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

15 *τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν*] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

21 *τις*] + *ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

To these cases I add:

$\mathfrak{S}^{vg} = \mathfrak{L}^{gp}$.

i. 15 *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ (so also $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$), $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Aug.*[c]

v. 21 *τῶν υἱῶν*] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

viii. 21 *τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ*] *τῇ πίστει ταύτῃ* $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Aug.*

ix. 30 *καί*] + *ἐκεῖθεν* $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

I now turn to $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$.

$\mathfrak{S}^{vg} = \mathfrak{L}^{h}$:

iv. 5 *ἐγένετο δέ*] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *καί* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

ib. *ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ*] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

13 *θεωροῦντες*] *ἀκούσαντες* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

ib. *ἦσαν*] conversati sunt $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

14 *τόν τε ἄνθρωπον βλέποντες*] videntes autem et illum infirmum (= *βλέποντες δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀσθενῆ Bl.*) $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: et videbant quod staret cum eis claudus ille qui sanatus fuerat $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

v. 27 *ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ*] *ἐνώπιον τοῦ συνεδρίου* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

28 *ἐπηρώτησεν . . . λέγων*] *ἤρξατο . . . λέγειν* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

ib. *καὶ ἰδού*] *ὑμεῖς δὲ ἰδού* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

34 τίμιος] καὶ τίμιος $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}$

vi. 2 τὸ πλῆθος] ὅλον τὸ πλῆθος $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Cypr.*

3 σοφίας] + τοῦ κυρίου $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

8 μεγάλα] *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

vii. 1 εἶπεν δέ . . . τῷ Στεφάνῳ] καὶ ἠρώτησεν . . . τὸν Στέφανον $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

ix. 19 ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἐν Δαμασκῷ μαθητῶν ἡμέρας τινάς] dies autem plurimos et in civitate Damasco cum discentibus fuit $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: fuitque aliquot diebus apud discipulos illos qui erant Damasci $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

xiv. 9 ἰδών] cognovit $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ (sciens $\mathfrak{E}$)

xviii. 2 Κλαύδιον] Claudius Caesar $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: Claudius . . . $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$

16 βήματος] + αὐτοῦ $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

xxiii. 15 ἐμφανίσατε τῷ χιλιάρχῳ *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: ὑμεῖς ἐμφαν. τῷ χιλ. σὺν τῷ συνεδρίῳ Γ, *cett.*: petite a tribuno $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: petite vos et principes synedrii a tribuno $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ (*conflat.*)

17 ἔφη] + αὐτῷ $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}$

18 τὸν νεανίαν $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: αὐτόν *cett.*

xxvi. 20 ἐκήρυξα (praedicavi) *Pap. Oxy.* 1597, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}$: ἀπήγγελλον *cett.*

28 πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον] πρὸς αὐτόν φησιν $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

xxvii. 13 παρελέγοντο] παρελεγόμεθα $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

To these I add :

$\mathfrak{S}^{vg} = \mathfrak{L}^{hp}$.

iii. 12 εὐσεβείᾳ] ἐξουσίᾳ $\mathfrak{L}^{hp2}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

vii. 44 ἡ σκηνή] καὶ ἡ σκηνή $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$: ecce tabernaculum $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

ix. 12 (11) Ταρσέα] τῷ γένει Ταρσέα $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$: qui est ex civitate Tarso $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

20 τῶν Ἰουδαίων $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: *om. cett.*

21 πάντας $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.*

$\mathfrak{S}^{vg} = \mathfrak{L}^{ht}$.

vi. 13 κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ τοῦ νόμου] κατὰ τοῦ νόμου καὶ κατὰ τούτου τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου $\mathfrak{L}^{ht}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

In the following cases $\mathfrak{S}^{vg} = \mathfrak{L}^{p}$, *sol.* :

v. 29 Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι] Πέτρος σὺν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

vii. 8 Ἰακώβ] + ἐγέννησεν $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

viii. 29 πνεῦμα] + τοῦ θεοῦ $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, + τὸ ἅγιον $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

ix. 32 διὰ πάντων] διὰ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων καὶ χωρῶν $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: διὰ τῶν πόλεων $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

These tables show, in addition to 7 agreements of $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, 34 agreements of $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ against $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ and 27 of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ against $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$. It must, however, be remembered that $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ only contains a portion of Acts, while $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ contains the whole. The agreements of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ are relatively much more numerous than those of $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$. If the comparison is restricted to the portions preserved in $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ (iii. 2–iv. 18; v. 23–vii. 2; vii. 42–viii. 2; ix. 4–24; xiv. 5–23; xvii. 34–xviii. 19;

xxiii. 8–24; xxvi. 20–32; xxvii. 1–12) we have only one example of agreement with 𝔏^{g} as against 27 with 𝔏^{h}. This is a very striking result.

I cannot put any other interpretation on these facts than that the translator of 𝔖^{vg} had access to Greek MSS. which contained a text similar to that which we find in 𝔏^{h}, and, to a less degree, in 𝔏^{g}. It may be noticed that in certain cases the reading of 𝔖^{vg} has passed into 𝔖^{ph} (v. 34; xviii. 18; xxiii. 17; xxvi. 20).

Agreements with Sahidic (𝔈).

v. 18 δημοσίᾳ] *om.* 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Luc.*

viii. 7 ἐξήρχοντο] + ἐξ αὐτῶν 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈

10 καλουμένη] *om.* 383, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈

xiii. 47 ἐντέταλκεν] praecepit nobis . . . sicut scriptum est 𝔖^{vg}: scriptura dixit 𝔈. Cf. dixit per scripturam *Cypr.*

Agreements with Irenaeus.

xv. 14 πρῶτον] *om.* 𝔖^{vg}, *Iren.*

xx. 6 πρὸς αὐτούς] *om.* 𝔖^{vg}, *Iren.*

Agreements with individual members of Γ.

vi. 7 τῶν ἱερέων] τῶν Ἰουδαίων ℵ, 𝔖^{vg}

vii. 55 πλήρης] + πίστεως καί ℵ, 𝔖^{vg}

xxiii. 23 δεξιολάβους] δεξιοβόλους *A*, 𝔖^{vg}

(3) THE PHILOXENIAN TEXT (S^{ph}).

The only edition of this text yet printed is that of J. White, Professor of Arabic in the University of Oxford, which appeared in three parts, viz. Evv. in 1778, Acts and Catholic Epistles in 1799, and Pauline Epistles in 1803. White used a MS. belonging to New College, Oxford, no. 333, cent. xi, which I term *O*. It came from Amida in Mesopotamia into the possession of G. Ridley, who left it to New College.

Since the appearance of White's edition a large number of MSS. have come to light, but, with one exception, they do not contain the Acts.[1] The exception is a Cambridge MS., *Add.* 1700 (*C*), written at Edessa in 1170. This MS., however, lacks the critical apparatus and marginalia, which are, in the Acts, of special importance. For these we are entirely dependent upon *O*.

White printed from *O* certain colophons proceeding from Thomas, Bishop of Harkel, who wrote them in 616. In these he refers to a translation made in 508 'in the days of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabog', also to his own labours upon the text. The statements made in these colophons are extremely important.

The first colophon comes at the end of Evv. and is thus translated by White:

> Est autem liber hic quattuor Evangelistarum Sanctorum qui versus est e lingua Graeca in Syriacam Aramaeam cum diligentia multa et labore magno, primum in urbe Mabug anno 819 Alexandri Macedonis [A.D. 508] diebus religiosi Mar Philoxeni Confessoris, Episcopi illius urbis.
>
> Collatus est autem postea cum diligentia magna a me Thoma paupere cum duobus exemplaribus Graecis valde probatis accuratisque in Antonia Alexandriae urbis magnae in monasterio sancto Antonianorum.
>
> Deinde descriptus est et collatus loco praedicto anno 927 ipsius Alexandri Indictione quarta [A.D. 616]. Quanta autem opera et cura fuerit mihi in illo Evangelistarum libro et sociis eius, Actibus nimirum Apostolicis et Epistulis, Dominus solus novit, qui retributurus est unicuique secundum opera sua in iudicio suo iusto et recto: in quo digni efficiamur misericordia ab eo. Amen.

The second colophon occurs at the end of Jude.

> Explicit liber sanctus Actuum Apostolicorum et Epistularum Catholicarum septem. Descriptus est autem ex exemplari accurato eorum qui versi sunt

[1] A list of known MSS. is given by Baumstark, *Gesch. der Syr. Literatur*, pp. 188–9. That previously published by Gregory in Tisch., vol. iii, pp. 853–9, is very inaccurate. He mentions 10 MSS. of Acts! Dr. Mingana informs me that he has in his collection three other MSS., one of which he refers to cent. ix, but that none of them contains Acts. The oldest dated MSS. of Evv. are *Laur.* i. 40 (at Florence), A.D. 757, and *Vat.* 268, A.D. 859. Adler in his valuable work *De versione Philoxeniana* (1789) gives select readings from *Vat.* 268 (= Assemani 1), *Vat.* 267 (Assemani 2) and two minor MSS. No similar collation of MSS. has appeared since.

diebus memoriae piae Sancti Philoxeni Confessoris, Episcopi Mabugensis. Collatus est autem diligentia multa a me Thoma paupere ad exemplar Graecum valde accuratum et probatum in Antonia Alexandriae, urbis magnae, in monasterio sancto Antonianarum, sicut reliqui omnes libri, socii eius.

O ends abruptly at Heb. xi. 27, so the colophon to the Pauline Epistles is lacking. *C*, in which the Epistle is complete, has one, but I look on its authenticity as dubious. It certainly does not proceed from Thomas, since it is not written in the first person and he is called 'Bishop of Mabog', not 'poor Thomas'.[1]

I now offer some remarks upon these colophons.

Philoxenus, or Mar Xenaia, is the well-known Monophysite leader, into whose career it is not necessary for me to enter here. Thomas does not give the name of the translator, but this information is supplied by Moses of Agel, who, writing to Paphnutius in the same century, says:

> Versiones Novi Testamenti et Davidis a Polycarpo clarae Mariae Chorepiscopo ad Xeniam Mabugensem Syriace elaboratam evolvas, ubi mirari est tot varietates quae in versione Syriaca e Graeco confecta cernuntur.[2]

Polycarp, the author of the translation, was χωρεπίσκοπος or 'suffragan' to Philoxenus.

In the second paragraph of the first colophon Thomas, speaking in the first person, says that he 'collated' this translation with two Greek MSS. For *two* some MSS. have *three*, and in a note to Mt. xxviii. 5 Thomas speaks of *three* Greek MSS.[3] The number, therefore, is uncertain. The MSS. belonged to the library of the Enaton, a monastery nine miles from Alexandria,[4] in which he did his work.

The third paragraph merely states that he made a fair copy, i.e. of the text *plus* the result of his collations, and compared this with the rough draft.

In the second colophon Thomas speaks, not of two (or three) Greek MSS. as in Evv., but of a single Greek MS., also belonging to the Enaton.

It is to be observed that Thomas only speaks of *one translation*, that made

[1] The colophon was printed by Prof. R. L. Bensly in his work on 'The Harklean Version of the Epistle to the Hebrews (1889)'. It states that the Pauline Epistles 'were written and collated with the MS. written at Mabog, and were also collated with a MS. at Caesarea in the library of Pamphilus, which was written by his own hand'. This mention of Pamphilus is somewhat suspicious, since no reference to him occurs in the other colophons. It goes on to say that it was translated into Syriac in the time of Philoxenus in the year of Alexander 819, and subsequently 'collated' in the Enaton with the help of two accurate Greek MSS. through the diligence of 'Thomas, Bishop of Mabog, and his friends, together with the Gospels and the Acts in the year 927 of Alexander in the Enaton'.

[2] Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, ii, p. 83.

[3] Thomas says, according to *O*: '*In tribus exemplaribus Graecis . . . non inventum est*'. So Mt. xxvii. 35 where *O* has *non inventa est in duobus exemplaribus Graecis* the MSS. of Assemani give *tribus* (Adler, p. 96).

[4] F. M. Abel, *Oriens Christianus*, i (1911), pp. 78–82. It was so called as being ἐν τῷ ἐνάτῳ = *ad nonum* (*miliarium*).

for Philoxenus (*versus est e lingua Graeca*). All that he claims to have done himself is to 'collate' MSS. He says nothing about any revision of the text.

There is also another subject about which he gives no information, viz. the extensive use of critical signs, obels and asterisks, which occur throughout *O* and at once attract the eye of the reader. Did Thomas insert them? If he did, why does he not say so?

Before I go further, it will be well to say a few words about the characteristics of this version. That it has been taken immediately from the Greek is obvious. This is shown by the occurrence of transliterated Greek words in the text[1] and by painful attempts to render Greek idioms in defiance of literary style. In this respect it contrasts strongly with the freedom of the Peshitto. The result, however, is that we are seldom in doubt as to the exact reading of the Greek original. It is significant that many, or most, MSS. of Evv., and *O* both in Evv. and elsewhere, contain in the margin a number of Greek words with a reference-mark attached to the Syriac words in the text by which they have been translated. Until the MSS. of Evv. have been collated, we cannot say to what extent the lists agree, but the scanty information now at hand shows great similarity. It is probable that this collection of Greek words goes back a long way in the history of the version.[2]

White considered the text of this version to be Philoxenian, i.e. the work of Polycarp. He attributed the obels and asterisks as well as the marginalia to Thomas. I pass over for the moment his explanation of the obels and asterisks, in order to keep to the main issue, viz. the authorship of the translation. This view, which appears to agree with the plain meaning of the colophons, was generally held until recent times, when another view, which appears now to hold the field, came into favour. This is that Thomas not only did what White had attributed to him, but that he either rewrote the translation or revised it so radically as to change its character completely. According to the advocates of this interpretation the version of Polycarp is lost and the text which we have is Harklean, not Philoxenian.

I do not think it profitable to discuss this theory until a certain amount of spade-work has been done. I content myself here with the remark that 'poor Thomas' must have been a singularly modest person, if he thus understated the amount of his own work. I, therefore, leave alone for the moment the main issue, and address myself to a smaller point which has also been a subject of much controversy. This is the use and significance of the obels and asterisks,[3] whoever their author may have been.

It is agreed that these symbols, which had been previously used by critics of Homer in a different application, were introduced into Biblical literature by Origen, who in his Hexapla affixed asterisks to passages found in the Hebrew but absent from the Greek of the Septuagint, and obels to passages present in

[1] e.g. Mt. xix. 28 ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ] entipaliggenesia.

[2] White (p. xvi) ascribes them to Polycarp.

[3] The obel is denoted by ÷ and the asterisk by ※. A metobelus ⸔ is placed at the end of an obelized or asterisked passage, e.g. Lk. viii. 52 *non* ※ *enim* ⸔ *mortua est* ※ *puella* ⸔, Acts xii. 25 *Saulus* ※ *qui vocabatur Paulus* ⸔ *reversi sunt ab Hierosolyma cum complevissent ministerium* ÷ *suum* ⸔.

the Greek but absent from the Hebrew. Jerome, who in certain of his works adopted this practice from Origen, says:

> 'Ubicumque praecedentes virgulas ÷ videritis, sciatis ea quae subiecta sunt in Hebraeis voluminibus non haberi. Porro ubi stellae imago fulserit ⁜ ex Hebraeo in nostro sermone addita.'[1]

In his Preface to Daniel[2] he states that the use of obels and asterisks was familiar in his time to all the Christian Churches—Greek, Latin, Syrian, and Egyptian. This statement as to the widespread diffusion of these symbols at this early date[3] is important.

It is prima facie likely that the use of obels and asterisks in this text corresponds with the practice of Origen and Jerome. If so, we should naturally expect asterisks to refer to passages present in the Greek but absent from the Syriac, and obels to refer to passages present in the Syriac, but absent from the Greek. This explanation commended itself to White, but he was conscious of a great difficulty, viz. that on a number of occasions in Evv. and once in Acts (ix. 4) it is expressly stated in the marginalia of Thomas that an asterisked passage in the text was not in the Greek. I shall return to this subject later on.

A rival theory was started by a contemporary scholar, Wetstein, viz. that the critical signs refer to the differences between the two Syriac texts, i.e. $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ and $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, the obel being affixed to readings of $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ which were not adopted by the maker of $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, while the asterisk was affixed to readings omitted in $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$.[4] His theory was preferred to White's by some good judges, e.g. Adler and Storr, but, as White points out (p. xxvii), it is open to the objection that an asterisk is not infrequently attached to readings which occur in $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$.

More recently P. Corssen, after giving instances where an asterisk is used whereas an obel would be expected, concludes that an asterisk could be used as an obel as well as in its proper sense.[5]

There is one point upon which every one is agreed, viz. that these signs were frequently confused in the course of transmission.[6] It is possible that when the MSS. of Evv. have been collated, many of the confusions will be removed. In the Acts, however, where we are dependent upon a single MS. written in the eleventh century, much corruption is inevitable. It is, therefore, well to proceed warily and not to expect too much.

The obels are much easier to deal with than the asterisks, since it is generally agreed that they are used to mark Syriacisms. It is also admitted that in a very large number of cases the obelized readings are to be found in $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$. Thus Ropes, after stating that obels are used 'in about forty-five instances' in Acts, remarks that 'three-quarters of these little supplements are found in the Peshitto also' (p. clxviii). In view of this admission, I am perplexed by a

[1] Migne, xxix, p. 62.

[2] Migne, xxv, p. 493.

[3] Labriolle, *Histoire de la Littérature Latine Chrétienne.* Table VII ascribes this work to 408–10.

[4] This controversy does not amount to much, since the passages which are added after an asterisk were clearly taken from a Greek source.

[5] *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.* 1901, p. 6.

[6] Thus Adler says (p. 51): *Sed omnino hae notae, ut Origeniano contextui quoque accidit, incuria librariorum saepe sunt permutatae, confusae, suo loco remotae.*

previous statement of his that 'the assumption that the signs (i.e. obels as well as asterisks) indicated some connexion with the Peshitto was mistaken... and the observation that the Peshitto should be left wholly out of account in the study of the signs has greatly facilitated the investigation' (p. clxvi).

These Syriacisms are of an unmistakable type. Most frequently they take the shape of an additional pronoun required by Syriac idiom, e.g. '*him*' is supplied after a verb, where it is not necessary in Greek: sometimes a noun is added where the Greek has an adverbial expression, e.g. ἐπὶ τρίς becomes *tertia vice*. Mixed up with these Syriacisms we find a number of readings which are peculiar to $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$.

My own observations seem to show that Ropes has underestimated the agreements between obelized words in $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ and $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$. I take first cases which require no comment.

(*a*) A pronoun added in $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ is obelized in $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$. This occurs in v. 27, 30; vi. 12; vii. 6, 21, 58; x. 23, 39; xi. 25; xii. 4, 25; xiii. 3, 29; xiv. 19; xvi. 10, 22, 23; xviii. 3 *bis*, 17.

We may class under this head the following additions: xvi. 19 *ex ea*: xvii. 34 *ex eis*: xviii. 20 *apud eos*: also of *ibi* in xiv. 3.

Some of these are genuine variants, being found in other authorities, but the majority are peculiar to $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$.

(*b*) A noun added by $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ is obelized in $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ in the following cases: v. 8 τοσούτου] *tanto pretio*: x. 15 ἐκ δευτέρου] *secunda vice*: x. 16 ἐπὶ τρίς] *tribus vicibus* (so also xi. 10): xi. 11 ἐξαυτῆς] *eodem momento* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *ex eadem hora* $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$.

(*c*) A copulative (*et*) added in $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ is obelized in $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: xviii. 22, 27.

(*d*) A preposition repeated before a second noun is obelized in $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: vi. 13 (*contra*); xviii. 28 (*de*).

To these must be added four cases where the obel is misplaced in *O*:

iv. 28 For ὅσα some authorities give ἅ. $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ has *omnia quae* (ὅσα): *O* has *omnia* ÷ *quae* ↙ This should be ÷ *omnia* ↙ *quae* (ἅ).

x. 25 πεσών] *et procidens* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$. *O* has ÷ *et procidit* ↙. Ropes points out that this is an error for ÷ *et* ↙ *procidit*. No MS. omits πεσών.

xiii. 25 τῶν ποδῶν] + αὐτοῦ $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$. *O* gives ÷ *pedum ipsius* ↙ This is an error for *pedum* ÷ *ipsius* ↙

xvi. 29 πρὸς τοὺς πόδας $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ (so *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *om. cett.*). *O* has *ad* ÷ *pedes* ↙. This is an error for ÷ *ad pedes* ↙

In two cases there is a slight difference, viz.:

xi. 9 ἐκ δευτέρου] $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ has *ex secunda* ÷ *vice*. $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ according to Schaaf's rendering has *rursus*. This is odd, since elsewhere he regularly ascribes *vice* (*vicibus*) to $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$.

xviii. 21 ἀνήχθη] *iter fecit per mare* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *et conscendit* ÷ *navem* ↙ $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$. This is a small difference in phrasing.

There remains one case which does not admit of this explanation. In xi. 2 there is a long passage (ὁ μὲν οὖν Πέτρος . . . διδάσκων αὐτούς) found in *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, *vg.*^{qw}, but omitted by Γ, *cett.* ($\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$). $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ has, after a preceding asterisk, *ipse*

quidem igitur Petrus . . . ÷ et ↙ docuit eos ↙. The metobelus at the end is correct, and shows that the whole passage was omitted by 𝕾vg. The obel before *et* cannot therefore refer to 𝕾vg. There appears to be some error here.

I have, to the best of my belief, now given all the cases in Acts in which *O* has an obel. It will be seen that, apart from xi. 9 and xviii. 21 where the difference is very slight, there is only one exception, viz. xi. 2. I submit, therefore, that the connexion between the obels in 𝕾ph and additions in 𝕾vg is proved.

The matter, however, does not rest here. Mr. Valentine Richards made the observation, apparently for the first time, that in *O* obels cease to be employed after ch. xviii, and that in the later chapters only asterisks occur.[1] He did not, however, proceed to draw any conclusion from his observation. Ropes (p. clxix, n. 1) calls this a suggestive fact, but does not say what it suggests. His own view is that in numerous cases after this point 'the use of the asterisk is not to be distinguished from the characteristic use of the obelus and is equally negligible for our purpose'. The inference, surely, is that after ch. xviii the scribe became tired of using both symbols and dropped one of them.[2] The result is that after ch. xviii we find asterisks continually prefixed to characteristic readings of 𝕾vg, in place of the obels used in chs. i–xviii. I give two examples by way of illustration:

xix. 35 ὁ γραμματεύς] princeps civitatis 𝕾vg: scriba ※ civitatis 𝕾ph. Here an obel is required.

ib. τοῦ διοπετοῦς] eius quae de caelo descendit 𝕾vg: diopetous ※ eius 𝕾ph

The confusion thus created is not so great as might have been expected, since the great majority of the asterisked passages after ch. xviii fall into two classes which can be recognized at the first glance. Some are additions of a substantial character, vouched for in many instances by other members of *Z*. These are rightly asterisked. Others are trivial additions, especially of pronouns, and agree with characteristic readings of 𝕾vg. It is, therefore, perfectly simple to separate the sheep from the goats.

Asterisks appear to have been substituted for obels in the following passages:

xix. 23 ὁδόν] + dei 𝕾vg (+ domini 𝕷dg): ※ dei 𝕾ph

35 γραμματεύς] princeps civitatis 𝕾vg: scriba ※ civitatis 𝕾ph

ib. τοῦ διοπετοῦς] imaginem eius quae de caelo descendit 𝕾vg: διοπετοῦς ※ eius 𝕾ph

xx. 38 ἐπί *D*: εἰς Γ*E*δ: usque ad (= ἕως ἐπί cf. xvii. 14) 𝕾vg: ※ usque ad 𝕾ph

xxi. 11 παραδώσουσιν] + eum 𝕾vg, *vg.*aq: ※ eum 𝕾ph

19 ἐξηγεῖτο] + eis 𝕾vg: ※ eis 𝕾ph

xxii. 28 γεγέννημαι] in ea natus sum 𝕾vg: ※ in ea ↙ natus sum 𝕾ph

[1] *J.T.S.* ii (1901), p. 443.

[2] No obels occur in the Catholic Epistles. In the Gospels their distribution varies. I have only noticed one case in Jn. xiv–xx, viz. xvi. 7 *dico vobis ÷ quod ↙ expedit.* Insertions of *quod* (ὅτι) after *verba dicendi* are generally marked with an asterisk, e.g. Mk. xiv. 14, Lk. iii. 8, Jn. vii. 41, but in Lk. iv. 8 an obel is used.

xxiii. 6 περὶ ἐλπίδος] et de spe $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ※ et ↙ de spe $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
13 τεσσεράκοντα] + viri $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: quadraginta ※ viri $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
15 ἐγγίσαι αὐτόν] + ad vos $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: appropinquet ※ ad vos $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
16 τὴν ἐνέδραν] insidias has $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: insidias ※ has $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
17 ἔφη] + ei $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: dixit ※ ei $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
18 ἠρώτησεν] + a me $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: petiit ※ a me $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
23 εἶπεν] + eis $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: dixit ※ eis $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
xxvi. 13 βασιλεῦ] o rex $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ※ o ↙ rex $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
xxvii. 1 ἑκατοντάρχῃ] + cuidam $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ※ cuidam $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
xxviii. 7 ἐξένισεν] + domi suae $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ※ domi suae $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
10 ἀναγομένοις] + inde $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ※ inde $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
21 ἐλάλησεν] + nobis $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ※ nobis $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
28 αὐτοί] + enim $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ※ enim $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$

These instances are taken from chs. xix–xxviii. It is prima facie probable that occasional mistakes of this kind occur in the previous chapters. I draw attention to the following cases:

ii. 22 προσπήξαντες] crucifixistis $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: affigentes ※ cruci $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
iv. 23 διεμαρτύρατο] + eis $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ※ eis $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
v. 8 πρὸς αὐτήν] ei $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ※ ei $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
vii. 51 σκληροτράχηλοι] o duri cervice $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ※ o ↙ duri cervice $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ (cf. xxvi. 13)
viii. 7 ἐξήρχοντο] + ab eis $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ※ ab eis $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
xv. 10 νῦν οὖν] + vos $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ※ vos $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
36 τοῦ Κυρίου] + et videamus $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ※ et videamus $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
xvi. 13 ταῖς συνελθούσαις γυναιξί] + ibi $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ※ ibi $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$
28 ἐφώνησεν] + ei $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: ※ ei $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$

These 29 cases, where an asterisk has been substituted for an obel, should be added to the 40 obels previously discussed.

In view of these facts I venture to compare the remaining asterisked passages in Acts with the readings of $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$.

(A) Asterisked passages in $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, which are omitted by $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$.

i. 18 ※ suae] αὐτοῦ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{t}$: *om. cett.*

v. 22 ※ aperuerunt domum custodiae] καὶ ἀνοίξαντες τὴν φυλακήν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: *om. cett.* (στ.)

39 ※ neque vos, neque reges, neque tyranni; absistite ergo ab hominibus his] οὔτε ὑμεῖς οὔτε βασιλεῖς οὔτε τύραννοι· ἀπέχεσθε οὖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτων *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ (*ex parte alii*) : *om. cett.* (2 στ.)

vi. 8 ※ per nomen Domini] διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *D* 614, $\mathfrak{L}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: *om. cett.* (στ.)

vii. 4 ※ et patres vestri ante vos] καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν *D* : cf. *E*, *Aug.* : *om. cett.* (στ.)

vii. 21 ※ in flumen] παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν *DE*, *vg.*^{aw} : *om. cett.*

43 dicit Dominus, Deus omnipotens ※ nomen ei] λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ 614 : cf. *Filaster* (*v.* 42 *post* Ἰσραήλ) : λέγει κύριος *C* : *om. cett.*

viii. 13 virtutes et signa ※ magna] δυνάμεις καὶ σημεῖα δ : σημεῖα καὶ δυνάμεις μεγάλας *cett.* (𝔖^{vg})

24 ※ obsecro] παρακαλῶ *D*, 𝔏^{g} : *om. cett.*

39 ※ cecidit in eunuchum: angelus autem Domini] ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐνοῦχον. ἄγγελος δὲ κυρίου *A* (*m.* 1 in *ras.*), 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{aqw}, *Aug. Hier. Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (*def. D*)

ix. 6 ※ ille autem tremens et pavens super eo quod factum fuerat ei dixit: Domine, quid vis me facere? Et Dominus ad eum, Surge] The whole of this passage occurs in 𝔏^{h} and Ephrem, while parts of it are given by 𝔏^{pt}, *Aug.*, and others. It is omitted by Γ, *cett.* (*def. D*). After *surge* 𝔖^{ph} has *sed surge* (so Γ), conflating the variants.

12 (11) ※ quendam] *om. cett.* (*def. D*)

37 ※ cum esset autem Petrus Lyddae] *om. cett.* (*def. D*). The addition is taken from *v.* 38. *Autem* is superfluous after a preceding *autem*, which shows that it has come into the text *ab extra.*

40 ※ in nomine Domini nostri Iesu Christi] So 𝔏^{gh} *vg.*^{a}, 𝔈, *Cypr.*, *alii* : *om. cett.* (*def. D*)

x. 19 ※ et haesitaret] So 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q} : *om. cett.* (*D*)

33 ※ rogans ut venires ad nos] παρακαλῶν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ἡμᾶς *D*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q} : *om. cett.* (στ.)

39 ※ reiecerunt Iudaei ↙ et occiderunt] A similar reading appears to have been in 𝔏^{p}, in which *Iudaei* is still visible, but the rest of the passage is lost. *Cett.* (*D*) give ἀνεῖλον, to which 𝔖^{vg} adds *Iudaei.*

41 ※ cum eo dies quadraginta] ἡμέρας .μ. *DE*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*^{aqw}, 𝔈, *Aug. Ephr.* : *om. cett.*

xi. 1 ※ et benedicebant Deo. Ipse quidem igitur Petrus per tempus non modicum volebat abire Hierosolymam et loqui fratribus, et cum confirmasset *eos* profectus est] An addition similar to *et benedicebant Deo* is found in 𝔏^{gp2} : *om. cett.* (*D*). For the rest of the passage *D* has ὁ μὲν οὖν Πέτρος διὰ ἱκανοῦ χρόνου ἠθέλησε πορευθῆναι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ προσφωνήσας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ἐπιστηρίξας αὐτούς (*om.* ἐξῆλθεν). So 𝔏^{p} (+ profectus est) : *om. cett.*

17 ※ ut non daret eis Spiritum Sanctum cum credidissent in Dominum Iesum Christum] τοῦ μὴ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα ἅγιον πιστεύσασιν ἐν αὐτῷ *D* : cf. 𝔏^{p}, *Aug.* : *om. cett.* (2 στ.)

xii. 1 ※ quae in Iudaea] ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ *D* 614, 𝔏^{p} : *om. cett.*

5 ※ a cohorte regis] So 𝔏^{p} (*m.* 1) : *om. cett.* (*D*)

6 ※ Petro] τῷ Πέτρῳ *D*, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔈 : αὐτῷ 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.*

20 ※ ex duabus civitatibus] ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν πόλεων *D* 614 : *om. cett.*

22 ※ reconciliatus est eis autem] *καταλλαγέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῖς* Τυρίοις (+ *καὶ τοῖς Σιδωνίοις* $\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$) *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p2}$: *om. cett.* (*στ.*)

25 ※ qui vocabatur Paulus] *ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Παῦλος* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: *om. cett.* (*D*)

xiii. 8 ※ quia iucunde audiebat eos] *ἐπειδὴ ἥδιστα ἤκουεν αὐτῶν D*, cf. *E* : *om. cett.* (*στ.*)

19 eorum ※ alienigenarum] *τῶν ἀλλοφύλων D* : *αὐτῶν cett.* The readings are conflated in $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$.

28 ※ in eo] *ἐν αὐτῷ D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gt}$, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

32 ※ Dominum nostrum] *τὸν κύριον* (+ *ἡμῶν* 614) *D* 614, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

39 ※ et paenitentia] *μετάνοια D* : *om. cett.*

41 ※ et tacuit] *καὶ ἐσίγησαν D* : *καὶ ἐσίγησεν* 614 : *om. cett.* (*στ.*)

43 ※ rogantes baptizari] *ἀξιοῦντες βαπτισθῆναι δ* : *om. cett.* (*D*)

47 ※ gentibus] *ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* 614 : *om. cett.* (*hoc loco*)

xiv. 25 ※ evangelizantes eis] *εὐαγγελιζόμενοι αὐτοὺς D δ* : *om. cett.* (*στ.*)

xv. 2 ※ ut diiudicarentur coram eis] *ὅπως κριθῶσιν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς* (*post* Ἱερουσ.) *D* : *post ζητήματος τούτου δ* (= $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$) : *om. cett.*

4 ※ magnifice] *μεγάλως DC δ*, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

12 ※ cum assensissent autem simul seniores iis quae a Petro dicta fuerant] *συγκατατιθεμένων δὲ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Πέτρου εἰρημένοις D*, *Ephr.* : *om. cett.* (2 *στ.*) In the same sentence $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ has a repeated *autem*, conflating the readings of *D* and *cett.*

ib. ※ omnia ⸔ quae] i.e. *ὅσα* so *cett.* : *ὅ* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ (*sol.*). This is an interesting case, since it deals with a *proprius error* of $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: cf. iv. 28 (p. 309).

29 ※ et omnia quae nolitis vobis fieri aliis ne facite] *καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι ἑτέρῳ μὴ ποιεῖν D* 614 *c.Ath.*, *Iren. Cypr.* : *om. cett.* (2 *στ.*). $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ has no similar insertion in *v.* 21.

30 ※ Iudas et Silas] *om. cett.*

36 ※ placuit autem cogitatio Barnabae] *om. cett.*

xvi. 9 ※ coram facie eius] *κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ D δ* : ante eum 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

30 ※ et reliquos astrinxisset tuto, appropinquavit et] *τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀσφαλισάμενος D* : *om. cett.* (*στ.*). Nothing corresponding to *appropinquavit et* is given by any other authority.

39 ※ in carcerem] *εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν δ* : *μετὰ φίλων πολλῶν εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν D* : *om. cett.* (*στ.*)

ib. ※ exire, dicentes, nesciebamus ea quae de vobis, quod essetis viri iusti, ex hac civitate exite, ne forte convertantur rursus illi qui clamaverunt contra vos] *ἐξελθεῖν εἰπόντες, ἠγνοήσαμεν τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς ὅτι ἐστὲ ἄνδρες δίκαιοι, ἐκ ταύτης τῆς πόλεως ἐξέλθατε μήπως ἐπιστραφῶσιν πάλιν ἡμῖν οἱ ἐπικράξαντες καθ' ὑμῶν δ*, *Ephr.* *D* agrees with *δ*, apart from some small points, but is interpolated from Γ, *cett.* which have an abbreviated reading for the whole passage, viz. : *καὶ ἐξαγαγόντες ἠρώτων ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως* (*om. cett.*). In *D* this is placed after *δίκαιοι*.

A similar interpolation occurs in $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, but it is there placed after *καθ' ὑμῶν*.

xvii. 11 ※ sicut Paulus evangelizabat] *καθὼς Παῦλος ἀπαγγέλλει* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Prisc. Ephr.*: *om. cett.* (*D*)

19 ※ post autem dies aliquot] *μετὰ δὲ ἡμέρας τινάς D* δ : *om. cett.*

xviii. 8 ※ per nomen Domini Iesu Christi] *διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (*sim.*) *D* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* (*στ.*). In *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ these words come at the end of the verse, while δ and $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ place them earlier, after *ἐπίστευον*.

12 ※ et iniecerunt manus in eum] *καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, 𝔈 : *om. cett.* (*στ.*)

ib. ※ ad proconsulem ↙ ante tribunal] ad proconsulem $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα cett.* (*D*). $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ conflates.

19 ※ sabbato sequenti ↙ et eos reliquit ibi] Two variants are here combined, viz.: *τῷ ἐπίοντι σαββάτῳ* ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, 𝔈) and *κἀκείνους κατέλιπεν ἐκεῖ* (Γ *E* δ). *D*, like $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, combines them, giving *καὶ τῷ ἐπιόντι σαββάτῳ ἐκείνους κατέλιπεν ἐκεῖ*. $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ omits both.

27 ※ in Achaiam] *εἰς τὴν Ἀχαΐαν D* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, so also *pap. Mich.* : *om. cett.* (*hoc loco*), but have them after *διελθεῖν* (*supra*). $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ has them in both places (conflation).

xix. 5 ※ Christi in remissionem peccatorum] This is an interesting case, since *Χριστοῦ* is found in $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ as well as in *D* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, 𝔈 (*om.* Γ *E*), while *εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν* (so *D* δ *pap. Mich.*) is omitted by $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ with *cett.* (*στ.*). The asterisk, therefore, covers two *Z* readings, one of which is found in $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ while the other is not.

9 ab hora quinta usque ad horam decimam ↙ (the asterisk before *ab* is lost)] *ἀπὸ ὥρας .ε. ἕως δεκάτης D* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, *Ambst.* (*sim.*): *om. cett.*

25 ※ cooperarii] *συντεχνῖται D*, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

xx. 23 ※ Hierosolymae] *ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, 𝔈, *Ephr.*: *om. cett.*

26 ※ quapropter] *διότι* (*διό*) *cett.* : *om.* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ (*sol.*)

32 ※ cui gloria in saecula. Amen] *αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν* δ : *om. cett.*

xxi. 11 vincient ※ eum] No other authority is quoted for *αὐτόν* here. It is superfluous after *τὸν ἄνδρα*.

29 introduxisset ※ eum] The pronoun is here superfluous, since *ὅν* comes at the beginning of the sentence (so also in $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$). All other authorities, except $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, have *ὃν ἐνόμιζον* (*sim.*) *ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν εἰσήγαγεν ὁ Παῦλος*. $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ has *et putabant quod cum Paulo ingressus esset in templum*. The asterisk here seems to indicate a variation from the free translation given in $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$.

31 ※ vide igitur ne faciant insurrectionem] *om. cett.* (*D*)

xxii. 3 ※ traditionum paternarum mearum] *τοῦ θεοῦ* (*νόμου vg.*) *cett.* : *om.* 614. This interpolation is taken from Gal. i. 14. Its coincidence with the omission of *τοῦ θεοῦ* in 614 is to be noticed.

5 ※ Ananias] Ἀνανίας δ: *om. cett.* (*D*)

29 ※ et illico solvit eum] καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔλυσεν αὐτόν 614, $\mathfrak{E}$, *Cass.*: *om. cett.* (*def. D*)

30 ※ misit ↙ solvit] πέμψας ἔλυσεν δ: *om.* πέμψας *cett.* The use of *misit* for *misit et*, or *mittens*, shows that the addition has come *ab extra.*

xxiii. 24 ※ in Caesaream] εἰς Καισάρειαν 614, *Ephr.*: *om. cett.*

ib. ※ timebat enim ne forte raperent eum Iudaei et occiderent eum, et ipse postea calumnias sustineret, tanquam qui pecuniam accepisset] ἐφοβήθη γὰρ μήποτε ἁρπάσαντες αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτενωσι (*sic* 614) καὶ αὐτὸς μεταξὺ ἔγκλησιν ἐχῇ ὡς ἀργύριον εἰληφώς 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp2}$ *vg.*^{aw}, *Cass.*: *om. cett.*

29 ※ abduxi eum vix violentia] ἐξήγαγον αὐτὸν μόλις τῇ βίᾳ 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *om. cett.*

xxiv. 9 ※ cum dixisset autem ille haec] εἰπόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα 614: *om. cett.*, inserting δέ after συνεπέθεντο. $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ has the same insertion (conflation).

xxv. 26 domino ※ meo] τῷ κυρίῳ *cett.*: $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ omits the words. Probably the asterisk should come before *domino.*

xxvi. 30 ※ et cum haec ipse dixisset] καὶ ταῦτα εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ (*om.* αὐτοῦ 614) δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.*, inserting τε after ἀνέστη. $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ has *autem* in the same place (conflation, cf. xxiv. 9).

xxvii. 5 ※ per dies quindecim] δι' ἡμερῶν δεκαπέντε 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *vg.*^{a}, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: *om. cett.*

15 ※ flanti et collegimus artemonem] τῷ πνέοντι (πλέοντι 614) καὶ συστείλαντες τὰ ἱστία 614, *c.Bedae* (*def. E*): *om. cett.*

19 ※ in mare] εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ (after ἐρρίψαμεν): $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ inserts the words at the end of the previous verse (after ἐκβολὴν ἐποιοῦντο). $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ appears to rectify the collocation of $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$.

35 ※ et dedit etiam nobis] ἐπιδιδοὺς καὶ ἡμῖν 614, $\mathfrak{E}$: cf. *Cass.*: *om. cett.*

41 ※ eo ubi Syrtis] *om. cett.* The words appear to be added from *v.* 17.

xxviii. 10 ※ in navi] *om. cett.*

14 inter eos manentes ※ apud eos] ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἐπιμείναντες 614: παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐπιμεῖναι Γ: *mansimus* $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *mansimus apud eos* $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$. $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ conflates ἐπ' αὐτοῖς and παρ' αὐτοῖς.

16 ※ centurio tradidit vinctos praefecto exercitus] ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης παρέδωκε τοὺς δεσμίους τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῃ δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ *vg.*^{aqw}, $\mathfrak{E}$: *om.* Γ, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

ib. ※ extra castra] ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$ *vg.*^{qw}, *Ambst.*: *om. cett.*

18 ※ multis] πολλά 614: *om. cett.* (Ropes corrects White's rendering to *multa.*)

19 ※ et clamarent, tolle inimicum nostrum] καὶ ἐπικραζόντων αἶρε τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἡμῶν 614: *om. cett.*

ib. ※ sed ut servarem animam meam a morte] ἀλλ' ἵνα λυτρώσωμαι τὴν ψυχήν μου ἐκ θανάτου 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$: *om. cett.*

29 ※ et cum haec ipse dixisset, exierunt Iudaei habentes disputationem

multam invicem] καὶ ταῦτα αὐτοῦ εἰπόντος ἀπῆλθον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πολλὴν ἔχοντες ἐν ἑαυτοῖς συζήτησιν δ, 𝔏gp, *Cass.*: *om. cett.*

30 ※ Iudaeos et Gentiles] Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας 614 (*hoc loco*): πρὸς Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας *post* διελέγετο (*v.* 31) 𝔏gp, *Ephr.*: *om. cett.*

To these I am inclined to add:

i. 13 ※ ὁ τοῦ ↙ Ἀλφαίου] White here renders in this way to show that 𝔖ph tries to render the Greek article. *D* has ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, while Γ *E* δ give Ἀλφαίου. 𝔖vg renders *filius Alphaei*, but this may well be a translation of Ἀλφαίου without ὁ τοῦ.

ib. ※ ὁ τοῦ ↙ Iacobi] Ἰακώβου *D*, *cett.* (filius Iacobi 𝔖vg)

I add some observations on these 86 (88) cases:

(*a*) The large majority of these variants are *Z* readings. As to their source there are two possibilities. Either they may have been taken from a MS. similar to *D*, or from a mixed MS. like δ (= 383, 614), i.e. vulgar in basis, but corrected from *Z*.

In favour of the first solution passages may be adduced in which asterisked passages are found in *D*, but not in δ, e.g. v. 22, 39; vii. 4, 21; viii. 24; x. 33, 41; xi. 17; xiii. 8, 20, 28, 39; xv. 12; xvi. 30; xviii. 12, 19; xix. 25; xx. 23. These instances, however, are not conclusive, since, just as 614 contains more *Z* readings than 383, a δ MS. which contained more *Z* readings than 614 may have been used.

The evidence in favour of a δ source is significant. I leave out of consideration the numerous agreements between 𝔖ph and δ, chiefly 614, after xxii. 9, where *D* ends, since in all probability many of them also occurred in *D* before it was mutilated.

In the earlier chapters attention may be called to the following agreements of 𝔖ph and δ, or 614, against *D*, viz.: vii. 43; viii. 13; xiii. 41, 43, 47; xv. 2; xvi. 39 *bis*; xvii. 11; xviii. 8; xx. 32; xxii. 3, 5. Some of these are particularly interesting. Three occur in passages found in *D* δ, 𝔖ph, but omitted by Γ, *cett.*, viz.: xv. 2 and xvi. 39 *bis*. In each of the three 𝔖ph agrees with δ against *D*. In three other cases (vii. 13; xx. 32; xxii. 5) 𝔖ph and δ (or 614) have a common interpolation not found in *D*, while in xxii. 3 an interpolation in 𝔖ph seems due to an omission in 614. In xiii. 47 a *proprius error* in 614 (+ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, repeated from the context) appears (without ἐν) in 𝔖ph. These striking agreements suggest consanguinity between 𝔖ph and δ. I, therefore, incline to the second solution.

(*b*) In eleven cases 𝔖ph gives evidence of conflation (ix. 6, 37; xiii. 19; xv. 12; xviii. 12, 19, 27; xxii. 30; xxiv. 9; xxvi. 30; xxviii. 14). These examples, most of which are undisguised, make it probable that the asterisked readings have come into the text *ab extra*. Except in ix. 37, where 𝔖ph has an addition otherwise unattested, xviii. 19, where 𝔖vg omits both variants, and xxviii. 14, where possibly an obel should have been used before *inter eos*, the asterisked passage is a *Z* variant which has been combined with the reading of 𝔖vg, *cett.*

(*c*) In three cases of special interest the asterisk is used to correct *proprii errores* of $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, viz.: xv. 12 ἅ for ὅσα; xx. 26 *om.* διότι; xxvii. 19 collocation of εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. In viii. 13 the asterisk before *magna* seems due to the fact that the order of $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *cett.* is varied. In xxi. 29 the asterisk before *eum* coincides with a departure from the loose rendering found in $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$.

(*d*) It is to be noticed that in a number of cases $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ agrees with Latin MSS. in a reading for which there is no Greek support now extant. Such agreement shows that these variants were not inventions of the West, but must have at one time existed in Greek MSS. The most important of these is the longer form of ix. 6, which was adopted in the traditional text of the Vulgate, put into Greek by Erasmus, and still survives in the A.V. Among the Latin MSS. the chief affinities of $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ are with $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$, with which it has some notable agreements (x. 19, 39; xii. 5) against all other MSS. $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ is also frequently found in company with $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, or one of them, also with *D*, and in one notable case with *A* (viii. 39). There is a striking agreement with $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ *sol.* in the conflated passage xviii. 19 (*ad proconsulem*). I do not lay stress upon the support given to many variants by mixed MSS. of the Vulgate, since there is reason to suppose that most of these are derived from MSS. belonging to the $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$ type.

(*e*) Some asterisked passages have no authority beyond that of $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$. These vary in character. Some of them are trifling matters, viz.: ix. 12 (11) (+τινα); xvi. 30 (+προσελθών); xxi. 11 (+αὐτόν). Others appear to be interpolations, viz.: ix. 37; xv. 30; xxii. 3; xxvii. 41; xxviii. 10. Two are highly plausible, viz.: xv. 36 and xxi. 31, in each of which it is probable that $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ preserves a στίχος which has dropped out in *D*, *cett.*

(B) I now proceed to the second list of asterisked passages, viz. those which differ from the first in that the readings in question agree with $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, with or without other authorities.

iii. 19 ※ vobis] ὑμῖν is given in the same place (after ἔλθωσιν) by $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, before ἔλθ. by Tert., before ἀναψύξεως by $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, after ἀναψ. by *E*: *om. cett.*

v. 3 ※ ad eum] ei $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: πρὸς αὐτόν *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{p}$: πρὸς Ἀνανίαν *D*: Ἀνανία *cett.*

33 ※ sermones hos] hos sermones $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$: ταῦτα *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *om. cett.* (*D*)

vii. 10 ※ Pharaone] Φαραὼ *cett.* ($\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$): *om.* 614

24 ※ ex genere suo] ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ (*om.* αὐτοῦ *D*) *DE*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.*

35 ※ super nos] ἐφ' ἡμῶν *cett.* ($\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$): *om. AB* 383

58 ※ eum] αὐτόν *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.*

viii. 37 ※ dixit autem ei, Si credis ex toto corde tuo licet. Respondens autem dixit. Credo filium Dei esse Iesum Christum] εἶπεν δέ . . . Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gpt}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Aug.*: cf. *Iren. Cypr.*: *om.* Γ δ, $\mathfrak{E}$ (*def. D*)

ix. 4 ※ durum est tibi calcitrare ad stimulos] σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν *E*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, *Aug. Petil. Hier.*: *om. cett.* (*def. D*). Thomas annotates, '*Non est hoc loco in Graeco* (i.e. in the Enaton MS.) *sed ubi enarrat de se Paulus*' (i.e. ch. xxvi. 14).

ix. 5 ※ Nazarenus] ὁ Ναζωραῖος *ACE*, 𝔏^{hpt}, 𝔖^{vg}, *Aug. Petil. Hil.*: *om. cett. Iren.* (*def. D*)

30 ※ nocte] διὰ νυκτός *E* 614, 𝔖^{vg}, ℭ: *om.* Γ 383 (*def. D*)

x. 31 ※ mihi] μοι 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{vg}: *om. cett.*

36 ※ enim] γάρ *DC*^{1} 614, 𝔏^{pt}, 𝔖^{vg}, ℭ: *om. cett.*

xii. 12 ※ fratres] ἀδελφοί 614, 𝔖^{vg}: *om. cett.*

14 ※ ei] αὐτῷ *E* 614, 𝔖^{vg}: *om. cett.*

17 ※ ingressus est et narravit ↙] The metobelus should come after *est*, not after *narravit*. εἰσῆλθεν καί *D*, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*^{q}, 𝔖^{vg}: *om. cett.*

xiv. 25 ※ domini] τοῦ κυρίου (θεοῦ *E*, 𝔏^{g}) *cett.* (𝔖^{vg}): *om. DB*

xv. 34 ※ Silae autem visum est manere ibi] ἔδοξε δὲ τῷ Σιλᾳ ἐπιμεῖναι αὐτοῦ *DC* δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, ℭ, *Ephr.*: *om.* ℵ *ABE*

36 fratres ※ qui] fratres qui sunt 𝔖^{vg}: ἀδελφοὺς τούς *D* δ: ἀδελφούς Γ *E cett.*

xviii. 5 ※ esset] εἶναι *cett.* (𝔖^{vg}): *om.* 383

11 ※ Corinthi] ἐν Κορίνθῳ *D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg}: ἐκεῖ 𝔏^{g}, ℭ: *om. cett.*

xix. 9 ※ gentium tunc] τῶν ἐθνῶν τότε (*om.* τότε *E*) *DE*, 𝔖^{vg} *hoc loco*: *post* ὡς δέ τινες *hab.* δ (*om.* τοτε 383): *om. cett.*

34 ※ una] μία *cett.* (𝔖^{vg}): *om.* 614

xxii. 26 ※ ei] αὐτῷ *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}: λέγων *cett.*

xxv. 10 ※ aliquid ↙ non] οὐδέν *cett.* (𝔖^{vg}): οὐκ 614

16 ※ ad perditionem] εἰς ἀπώλειαν δ, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}: *om. cett.*

xxvi. 15 ※ Nazarenus] ὁ Ναζωραῖος 614, 𝔏^{gp2} *vg.*^{q}, 𝔖^{vg}: *om. cett.*

xxvii. 7 ※ e regione Salmonae] κατὰ Σαλμώνην *cett.* (𝔖^{vg}): *om.* 614, 𝔏^{h}

xxviii. 12 ※ ibi] ἐκεῖ 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, ℭ: *om. cett.*

30 ※ Paulus] ὁ Παῦλος 383, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}: *om. cett.*

It is interesting to observe points of contact between some of these asterisks and δ, especially 614. Thus omissions of 614 are asterisked in vii. 10; xix. 34; xxvii. 7 (+ 𝔏^{h}). So in xxv. 10 a *proprius error* of 614 is rectified. The omission in xviii. 5 is peculiar to 383, while the addition in xxviii. 30 is also found in 𝔏^{g} and 𝔖^{vg}. The addition in xii. 12 is peculiar to 614 and 𝔖^{vg}. It is not easy to see on what principle some of these asterisks were employed. It is possible that in some cases obels should have been used.

Apart from these sporadic references to peculiarities in the δ text, most of the asterisked passages are well-known *Z* variants which are also found in 𝔖^{vg}. The chief cases are v. 33; vii. 24; viii. 37; ix. 4, 5; xii. 17; xv. 34; xviii. 11; xix. 9; xxv. 16; xxvi. 15.

A possible solution of the difficulty is that the author of the asterisks did not collate 𝔖^{vg} and his Greek MS. (or MSS.) at the same time. He may, therefore, have omitted to notice that some asterisked readings were also present in

𝔖vg.[1] Also, we must not expect complete accuracy from an ancient collator, in view of the mis-statements so frequently made by more recent scholars in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

To sum up, while the evidence that the obels refer to peculiarities of 𝔖vg is practically complete, it is clear that the great majority of the asterisks refer to readings taken from Greek MSS., though in some cases they were shared by 𝔖vg.

I now come to the most interesting of the problems connected with this text, viz. the marginalia. These, beyond all doubt, are the work of Thomas. They differ greatly in character. In Evv. they form a farrago of variants, taken from several sources, sometimes agreeing with *D* or other members of *Z*, sometimes with ℵ*B*, and sometimes with minuscules only. On various occasions he mentions his two (or three) Greek MSS. As a full list of these references is given by Ropes (pp. clxiii–clxiv), I abstain from quoting them myself. They reveal the interesting fact that in addition to his Greek MSS. he used a Syriac MS. not mentioned in his colophon. To this he refers on five occasions (Mt. xxvii. 35; xxviii. 5; Mk. viii. 17; xi. 10; Lk. xx. 33). He terms it *antiquus*, and on one occasion informs us that it had belonged to Philoxenus.[2] This description rouses our curiosity, but unfortunately, except in one instance, the readings in question are common to the Old-Syriac MSS., 𝔖cs, 𝔖vg, and most other MSS. The exception is Lk. xx. 34 where Thomas states 'in exemplari antiquo est *gignunt et gignuntur* sed in Graeco non est'. The words γεννῶσιν καὶ γεννῶνται are found in this order in 𝔖cs, as well as in some Old-Latin MSS. (𝔏ae) and various Fathers, including *Iren.*, *Clem.*, *Orig.*, and *Cypr.*, while *D* and other O.-L. MSS. give γεννῶνται καὶ γεννῶσιν. 𝔖vg omits them with Γ, *cett.* In connexion with this it may be mentioned that a number of obelized passages in Evv. occur in 𝔖cs, or in one of them, but not in 𝔖vg. It therefore appears probable that the *antiquus* of Philoxenus was a copy of the older version, not of 𝔖vg. No mention is made of this Syriac document in the notes to Acts or the rest of the volume.

It may be noted that in Evv., where we have a large number of MSS., some of them have important marginalia which are lacking in others. Thus *O* gives in the margin the Freer ending of Mark,[3] which is not reported by Adler as occurring in any other of his MSS., while on Mt. xx. 28 he reports from one of his MSS. (*Assemani* 1 = *Vat.* 268, written in 859, the oldest dated copy which

[1] Cf. xix. 5, where *O* has *in nomine Iesu* ※ *Christi in remissionem peccatorum* ↙. Here Χριστοῦ is found in 𝔖vg, together with *DδE*, while εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, which occurs in *Dδ pap. Mich.*, is omitted by 𝔖vg, *cett.* So in xi. 1 a short addition, for which no other authority is quoted except two mixed MSS. of the Vulgate, is combined under one asterisk with a longer passage found only in *D*, 𝔏p, and *vg.*qw.

[2] Mk. xi. 10 *Non in omnibus exemplaribus Graecis invenitur neque in illo Mar Xenaiae.*

[3] The note *adduntur alicubi et haec* is prefixed.

contains marginalia) a long addition[1] (= ὑμεῖς δὲ ζητεῖτε . . . χρήσιμον, a passage found in *D* with some Latin and Syriac support), which does not occur in *O*. It is, therefore, probable that in Acts, where we have the evidence of *O* only, a number of marginalia have not come down to us.

The marginalia in the Acts constitute one of the chief sources for our knowledge of the *Z* text. Since Thomas, according to his colophon, took them from a Greek MS., and since this MS. was obviously connected with *D* and the Michigan papyrus, I have thought it best to place *c.Th.* among the Greek witnesses immediately after *D* and the papyrus (pp. 226–33). This course has the advantage that it brings these very important marginalia to the notice of the reader as soon as possible in the inquiry. If treated here, they would greatly add to the length of this chapter, and introduce a fresh complication into the argument.

I now proceed to consider the facts which have been set before the reader.

In the first place I agree with White's view—which was first called in question by Bernstein in 1837—that the text is that of Polycarp, i.e. Philoxenian, according to the plain meaning of the colophons. Bernstein's view will be considered shortly. That the marginalia are the work of Thomas is not disputed. The authorship of the obels and asterisks is not so certain.

White regarded the critical signs as the work of Thomas, and this view has been almost universally accepted. It involves, however, two notorious difficulties. The first of these is candidly admitted by White in his Preface (p. xxix), viz. that on a number of occasions Thomas in his note expressly declares that an asterisked passage in the text was 'not in the Greek'. Is it credible that the same person would insert an asterisk before a passage in the text, and in his note say that it was *not* in the Greek? I will illustrate by a single example:

> Mt. xxviii. 5 *Iesum* ※ *Nazarenum* ↙ is in the text. Thomas annotates 'In tribus exemplaribus Graecis et uno Syriaco, illo antiquo, non inventum est nomen *Nazarenum*'.

I abstain from further quotations, since the passages are collected by Ropes (p. clxiii). A simple inspection will show that in such cases the notes are not meant to confirm the readings, but to show that the MS. authority for them is weak. The usual phrase is *non in omnibus exemplaribus invenitur*. Thomas seems to be criticizing the work of a previous editor.

There is a second and more serious difficulty, which is this. On what principle did Thomas in the Acts put one *Z* reading in the text, marked with an asterisk, and relegate another to the margin? In character there is no difference between them. The explanation offered by White was that when an addition was made to the context, the passage was put into the text and marked with an asterisk, and that when the difference was one of wording, the variant was put into the margin. This explanation is repeated by Blass, who says of

[1] This is preceded by the note *haec quidem in exemplis antiquis in Luca tantum leguntur, capite LIII. Inveniuntur autem in exemplis Graecis hoc loco, quapropter hic etiam a nobis adiecta sunt* (Adler, p. 91).

the Acts: *verba inde addita asterisco Thomas signavit*; *ubi alia verba pro aliis erant, adscripsit* (*ed. min.* p. xxviii), and no other has been advanced.

In Evv. it might possibly work, for the simple reason that Thomas does not add long variants of this kind, but in the Acts, where they abound, it is ludicrously untrue. It is unnecessary for me to give quotations. I content myself with references to ii. 37 *bis*; iv. 18; vi. 10; viii. 24; x. 25, 33; xii. 3; xiii. 29, 44; xiv. 4, 6, 19; xv. 2, 26; xvi. 4, 35; xvii. 9; xviii. 2, 4, 6, 22, 27; xix. 1, 6, 14; xxi. 16; xxiii. 15; xxiv. 24; xxv. 24; xxvi. 1, &c. In all these cases extra matter, sometimes of considerable length, is added in the marginalia. It is strange that so careful a scholar as Blass (*quem honoris causa nomino*) should have repeated this statement. Corssen (p. 12) rightly remarks: *Diese Beispiele zeigen, dass zwischen den Asteriscuslesarten und den Randlesarten auch insofern kein Unterschied ist, als auch unter jenen sich ebensowohl Varianten als Zusätze finden.*

I have long been of opinion that the asterisks and obels could not possibly have been inserted by the author of the marginalia, i.e. that Thomas found them already embedded in the text upon which he was commenting. It was more or less recently that I found myself to have been anticipated in this view by G. C. Storr and J. L. Hug. Storr, writing in 1780, immediately after the appearance of White's first two volumes, said:

> 'Aber können denn die Asterisci und Obeli nicht auch von Polycarpus selbst herrühren, der die ältere syrische Übersetzung bei Verfertigung der neueren gewiss vor Augen gehabt hat?'[1]

Hug afterwards said of Thomas:

> 'Doch müssen wir nicht glauben, dass er der erste die Obeln und Asterisken in den Philoxenianischen Text hineingetragen habe, sie waren früher und ursprünglich darin.'[2]

The merits of this explanation, which is ignored by recent writers, are that it supplies an answer to the difficulties above mentioned. Polycarp, when constituting his text, used a Greek MS., or MSS., which contained *Z* readings, probably belonging to the δ group. In Evv. Thomas used other Greek MSS., in Acts one which closely resembled *D*. Consequently when in Acts ix. 4 Polycarp inserted a passage from his MS., Thomas annotates '*Non est hoc loco in Graeco*', i.e. in the Enaton MS. The second difficulty as to the method of division between the asterisked passages and the marginalia also disappears. There was no method. Polycarp made a selection of *Z* readings, probably from a δ MS., which he put into the text. Thomas supplemented this by a fresh selection taken from the Enaton MS., which he put into the margin.

I now recall attention to the passage quoted from Moses of Agel at the beginning of this discussion. When he says of Polycarp's version *mirari est tot varietates quae in versione Syriaca e Graeco confecta cernuntur*, it is obvious that such a description would suit admirably a version in which Syriacisms were marked by obels and readings introduced from the Greek by asterisks.

I feel some hesitation about attributing the critical signs to Polycarp himself.

[1] *Repertorium*, vii, p. 50 (1780).
[2] *Einleitung N.T.* i, p. 383 (ed.[3] 1826).

The colophon is silent on the subject. They may have been introduced by a successor, either soon afterwards, as seems likely from the words of Moses, or at some later date during the century which elapsed between the work of Polycarp and that of Thomas. My doubts are due to an interesting difference between the MSS. of this version. They fall into two classes. One of these possesses critical signs, marginalia, and colophons, similar to those found in *O*. The oldest dated copy belonging to this class (in Evv.) is *Vat.* 268, written in 859. The second class has no critical signs, no marginalia, and in some cases (not in all) no colophons. If these were all of late date, the explanation would be simple, viz. that they had been omitted by copyists in the course of transmission. It is, however, a singular fact that the oldest of all dated copies, *Laur.* i. 40, written in 757, belongs to the second class, and lacks critical signs, marginalia, and colophons.[1] Adler speaks of this MS. thus (p. 55):

> 'Illa autem epigraphe quae ad historiam versionis pertinet et supra laudata fuit in hoc exemplo non adest neque umquam adfuit: codex enim in fine integer est. Crederem codicem nostrum apographum esse antiquioris Philoxenianae versionis, a Thoma Harclensi nondum revisae et castigatae, quam ob rem adnotationes criticae quoque, a Thoma adiectae, hic desiderantur. Attamen contextus ab Harclensi recensione parum differre videtur.'

I have obtained some photographs of selected passages both in *Laur.* i. 40 and *Vat.* 267, 268, which Mr. G. R. Driver has compared with the text of *O*. He reports that, apart from a few trivial points of phraseology and punctuation, the text of the four MSS. is identical. Adler was deterred from pushing his suggestion further, because he thought that Thomas must have made some alterations in the version of Polycarp. What, however, if Thomas made no alterations, but confined himself to the collation of MSS., which is all that he claims to have done in his colophons? In that case the text would be identical in MSS. of both classes. I am therefore inclined to suggest that *Laur.* i. 40 and, in all probability, other MSS. belonging to this class represent the version as it issued from the hands of Polycarp. If so, however, the obels and asterisks must have been inserted, not by Polycarp, but by some critic working after him, whose name has not been preserved. There is ample room for such critical work in the period between 508 and 614. This, of course, is only offered as a conjecture, which may be confirmed, or refuted, when the MSS. of Evv. are properly collated by Syriac scholars.

So far I have given the evidence and stated the conclusions to which, in my opinion, it appears to point. I have abstained from mentioning certain views advanced by recent scholars which seem to me based upon a misinterpretation of the colophons.

So long ago as 1837 G. H. Bernstein expressed the opinion that Thomas had done more than he states, and that he was the author of the text, as well as of the obels, asterisks, and marginal notes.[2] He based this view on statements

[1] According to Adler (p. 53), it has a Greek vocabulary in the margin or between the lines. It would be interesting to compare this with that found in the MSS. of the first class. In his *Reise nach Rom* (p. 65) he calls it a '*nicht sehr merkwürdiges Exemplar*' on account of its lack of an apparatus.

[2] *De Charklensi Novi Test. translatione Syriaca* (1837), p. 5.

of later writers, chiefly Gregory Bar-Hebraeus, the ecclesiastical historian (+1286) which, according to him, show that Thomas made a *third* translation after that of Polycarp and the Peshitto. He announced, therefore, that '*Charklensem non Philoxenianam interpretationem emisit Whitius*'.

This view was not regarded with favour until later on, when it found a doughty defender in the learned Syriac scholar Dr. J. Gwynn, with whose name it is now generally connected. He relied upon two lines of argument to support his case.

(1) He repeated Bernstein's quotations from Bar-Hebraeus and others, and regarded them as conclusive. He says that Bar-Hebraeus 'reckons three versions of the New Testament into Syriac, placing that of Thomas as one of the three, third in order, but distinctly on equal terms with the prior Philoxenian and even the Peshitto'.[1]

The chief passage in Bar-Hebraeus is to be found in his *Chron. Eccles.*, *edd. Abbeloos-Lamy*, i. 268 (Louvain, 1872). It runs as follows:

> 'Hoc tempore claruit Thomas Heracleensis e monasterio Taril qui a pueritia in monasterio Kenserinensi litteris Graecis excultus, postea Mabugi episcopus fuit. Exagitatus autem a Domitio Melitinensi in Aegyptum profectus est habitavitque in Anton Alexandriae, ubi memorabili diligentia correxit sacrum Evangelii codicem et reliquos Novi Testamenti libros exacta admodum et accurata emendatione post primam versionem Mabugi cura Philoxeni elaboratam.'

It seems obvious that what Bar-Hebraeus says about Thomas's work in the Enaton is drawn from the colophons. He says nothing about a 'new translation' or a 'third version on equal terms with the Peshitto and the Philoxeniana', but merely that he 'emended' the Philoxeniana, which is a very different matter. There is nothing to justify the positive statement of Gwynn.

The only other passage where Bar-Hebraeus mentions Thomas is when he is discussing the date of a person named Abas (Assemani, *Bibl. Orientalis*, ii. 91), of whom he says *praeceptorem habuit quempiam nomine Thomam qui primam novi Testamenti versionem a Mar Philoxeno Mabugensi elaboratam correxit.* Here, again, *correxit* is a vague term and does not imply a new translation. The only witness who ascribes this to Thomas is an anonymous Syrian of uncertain date, who says (in *Vat. Syr.* 16):

> 'Summum laborem subiit omnemque operam adhibuit ut sacrum Evangelium e Graeco in Syriacum plurimorum codicum adhibita collatione peraccurate traduceret, quod contigit in sacro Antonianorum monasterio anno DCCCCXXIV post LXXXI annos quam a sancto Philoxeno confessore et eiusdem Mabugi urbis Episcopo collatum fuerat.'

In this statement the dates are wrong, apart from other inaccuracies. Assemani says dryly:

Haec anonymus Syrus de Thoma, ubi tria affirmat quae omnino falsa sunt.

Still less value is to be attached to some colophons in late MSS. which are said to speak of a revision by Thomas. Adler long ago remarked (p. 45): *De*

[1] Smith's *Dict. Christian Biogr.* iv, p. 1017.

historia huius versionis quae novimus ex eodem fonte omnia fluxerunt, nimirum ex epigraphe eidem ad finem subiecta. Assemani says of the statements attributed to Bar-Hebraeus:

> 'Gregorii (i.e. Bar-Hebraei) testimonio testimonium ipsius Thomae praeferendum est qui versionem sub Philoxeno adornatam tantum emendasse se scribit, numquam vero suae versionis meminit.'

Ropes himself says (p. cliii):

> 'Later Syriac writers, Bar Salibi (+*c.* 1171), Bar-Hebraeus (+1286), and an anonymous life of Thomas of Harkel, of uncertain date, make similar statements about the Philoxenian, but seem to have had no further knowledge than could be drawn from the Harklean subscriptions.'

Gwynn's second line of argument is concerned with the minor Catholic Epistles (2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude). These did not form part of the Peshitto,[1] but appear in the version printed by White. In addition to this, there is a separate version of them printed in 1630 by E. Pococke from a Bodleian MS. The Pococke sylloge contains these four epistles only and has no colophons. It is, therefore, anonymous. Gwynn pointed out that, although the two versions differ in style, that printed by Pococke being free and flowing, not literal or 'servile' like its rival, there clearly is a connexion between them. The question, therefore, arises, which of them is prior to the other? He pronounced in favour of the Pococke text, and his judgment seems to be well founded. He proceeded to argue that, as White's text was known to be Harklean, not Philoxenian, the Pococke text, which was prior to it, must be Philoxenian. It was, therefore, the sole surviving fragment of the Philoxenian text, the rest of which was lost, having been supplanted by the new version of Thomas. He says, 'How it has chanced that the Philoxenian version, as a whole, has passed into oblivion, we cannot tell' (p. xxvii).

The logic of this argument appears to halt. Granted the priority of the Pococke text, it does not follow that it is Philoxenian. It may have come from an unknown translator. There is an obvious reason why the four Epistles are found together, viz. that they were not included in the Peshitto. It is, therefore, natural that a separate translation of them should be made subsequently. Why should this not have been used by Polycarp, just as he used the Peshitto in the rest of his version? This simple explanation would account for the similarities found in the two versions. If so, Gwynn's whole argument collapses.

Gwynn subsequently (1897) extended his argument to the Apocalypse, which was also absent from the Peshitto. There is no reason to suppose that it ever formed part of *O*, which ends at Hebr. xi. 27, since it is not in *C*, which is complete. The only ground for supposing that Thomas had anything to do with the Apocalypse is a highly suspicious statement in a very late MS., *Flor. S. Marci* 724, written in 1582, that it was copied from a very ancient autograph written by Thomas of Harkel in 616. The existence of this subscription

[1] Cosmas (viii. 292) says *παρὰ Σύροις δέ, εἰ μὴ αἱ τρεῖς μόνον αἱ προγεγραμμέναι, οὐχ εὑρίσκονται, λέγω δὴ Ἰακώβου καὶ Πέτρου καὶ Ἰωάννου· αἱ ἄλλαι γὰρ οὐ κεῖνται παρ' αὐτοῖς.*

had been known since 1709, when it was communicated to Lelong[1] by Montfaucon, but it was regarded as apocryphal. Adler, who used the MS., arguing on internal grounds, says (p. 79):

'Statuimus hanc Apocalypseos versionem ab alio quidem quam versio (*sic*) Syriaca vulgata Evangeliorum factam esse, sed Philoxenum auctorem non agnoscere.'

Two Syriac versions of the Apocalypse are in existence. One of these was printed by de Dieu in 1627, and the other was discovered by Gwynn in a Crawford MS. The first of these Gwynn terms Σ, the second he calls *S*. He finds a connexion between *S* and Σ similar to that existing in the two versions of the minor Catholic Epistles. In style *S* resembles the Pococke text, while Σ resembles that printed by White. His conclusion is that *S* is Philoxenian, while Σ is Harklean, 'in the sense that whoever may be the translator, the translation is Harklean in manner and language, the product, if not of Thomas himself, then of a disciple and continuator'.

The answer to this is that, as the Apocalypse was not included in the Peshitto, it was subsequently translated into Syriac by itself. *S* may be prior to Σ, but there is no reason for attributing *S* to Polycarp or Σ to Thomas.

It will be seen that Gwynn expresses himself in guarded language here. That he felt some qualms about his identifications may be seen from various admissions. Thus, when discussing the case of the minor Catholic Epistles, he confesses that in fact the colophon of Thomas naturally leads to a conclusion opposed to his own. So also, when writing on the Apocalypse, he is conscious that he may be charged with a *petitio principii*. While, however, he is cautious in stating the second part of his case, he has no hesitation about the first, viz. the supposed evidence of Bar-Hebraeus and others. This he regards as cogent.

The disciples of Gwynn are more confident than he was. His doubts are not mentioned, and his hypotheses are treated as ascertained facts. Thus Ropes says (p. clxxvi), 'The idea that the Philoxenian and Harklean texts were substantially identical is contradicted by Bar-Hebraeus, who speaks of the Harkleian as the third translation, the Peshitto and Philoxenian being the first two. And finally the idea is made impossible for all who have been convinced by the patent evidence adduced by Gwynn that the Philoxenian is still extant in the four minor Epistles and the Apocalypse, and that the Harklean was a drastic revision of it.' These are brave words, but he seems to forget that previously (p. clii) he has allowed that Bar-Hebraeus and other Syriac writers had no further knowledge than that furnished by the colophons. I have already shown that Bar-Hebraeus says nothing whatever about a 'third translation', but merely that Thomas 'corrected' the work of Polycarp. I leave the reader to estimate the value of Gwynn's 'patent evidence' and would merely observe that the hesitations and qualifications expressed by the inventor do not appear in Ropes's narration.

Before I go further I must refer to another attempt to extend the activities of Thomas, viz. by ascribing to him a share, and that a large one, in the edition of the Syriac Hexapla which is said to have been produced at Alexandria by Paul, Bishop of Tella, at the time when Thomas was working in the Enaton.

[1] *Bibl. Sacra*, i, p. 191 (1709).

Our information on this subject is drawn from a statement of Bar-Hebraeus[1] together with a colophon in a Paris MS., *Syr.* v, written in A.D. 710, and containing Kings iv. This colophon has been translated by various writers. I follow the rendering of Ceriani (*Monum. sacra et profana*, i, *fasc.* i, *Proleg.* p. iii):

'Vertit hunc librum a lingua Graeca in Syriacam iuxta textum LXX duorum Venerandus Pater Mar Paulus, Episcopus fidelium, in urbe magna Alexandriae, iussu et studio sancti et beati Mar Athanasii, Patriarchae fidelium in monasterio sancti Mar Zacchaei Callinicensis, cum degerent Alexandriae, diebus amatoris Dei Mar Theodori Archimandritae eiusdem coenobii, anno 928, indictione quinta. Quicumque legit oret pro amatore Dei Mar Thoma, diacono et syncello eiusdem sancti et beati Mar Athanasii Patriarchae, qui studiosam operam praestitit, et pro ceteris qui operam et laborem cum eo consociaverunt.'

The 'faithful' mentioned in this colophon are the Monophysites in Alexandria.

Before discussing this very circumstantial colophon, I proceed to give the only other evidence, which occurs in a British Museum MS., *Add.* 14,437, cent. viii. This is rendered by Wright (vol. i, p. 34) as follows: 'The original was taken from a copy in the library of Caesarea, collated with an exemplar in which was written, "I, Eusebius, have corrected to the best of my ability". The translation from the Greek tongue was made in the month of Shebat, in the year of the Greeks 927, fourth indiction, at the Enaton of Alexandria, in the holy convent of the Antonine monks.'

Various writers identify the Thomas described in the first colophon as *diaconus et syncellus* (= *cellae consors*) *Athanasii* with Thomas of Harkel, and, as Thomas of Harkel is known to have been connected with the Enaton, suppose that Athanasius, Paul, and Thomas of Harkel worked together in the Enaton, passing over the fact that, according to the first colophon, in which alone their names are mentioned, they are said to have done their work in the monastery of St. Zycha. They thus conflate the colophons, taking the names and facts from the first colophon and the place in which the translation was made from the second. This is very arbitrary. Ceriani rejects the identification as based upon a similarity of name. He observes '*idem nomen per se non unam indicat personam*'. He also points out that Thomas the *syncellus* appears to have been a deacon, while Thomas of Harkel was a bishop, and would at least have been described as *venerabilis*.

I now proceed to ask what is meant by the monastery of St. Zacha Callinicensis. There was a well-known foundation of this name at Callinicum in Osroëne on the Euphrates which was a centre of the Monophysites.[2] Assemani quotes various documents in which it is referred to (*Bibl. Orient.* ii, pp. 307, 344, 348, 385, 416). What, however, had it to do with Alexandria, where Athanasius then lived and worked? Recent writers give no answer. Eichhorn (*Repert.* vii. 227) strangely supposed the words *S. Zacchaei Callinicensis* to be the

[1] '*Testamentum Vetus septuagintavirale Paulus Episcopus Telae Mauslath e Graeco in Syriacum transtulit.*' *Horreum Mysteriorum* (Praef.).

[2] The Paris MS. contains a note stating that it belonged to the convent of Beth-Qouro-Maria, near Callinicum (Zotenberg, *MSS. Syriaques*, no. 27, p. 11).

official title of Athanasius '*der in dem Kloster des Mar Zachäus bei Kallinikum seinen Sitz hatte*' at the time when Theodorus was Abbot of that monastery. The context, however, shows clearly that some place in Alexandria is referred to. This was seen by Bruns (ib. viii. 92), who says, '*Fuit nempe monasterium Zacchaei Callinicensis Alexandriae cuius monasterii tum temporis praefectus erat Mar Theodorus. De hoc monasterio eiusque praefecto nihil certi dicere habeo*'. He then goes on to point out that Callinicum was a place in Mesopotamia, '*unde nihil nobis lucri in re praesenti*'. The solution seems very simple, viz. that the Monophysites of Callinicum had a house in Alexandria which bore the same name as the parent foundation in Osroëne. This would naturally serve as a centre for Monophysite partisans in the city.

I therefore treat the very circumstantial account given in the Paris MS. with great respect. If, however, Thomas, the *syncellus* of Athanasius, lived in the monastery of St. Zacha, while Thomas of Harkel lived in the Enaton, there is strong reason for not identifying the two. The subscription in the British Museum MS. is in a very different position. It mentions no names and gives no details, except that the translation it contains was made in the Enaton by an anonymous person. I look upon it as untrustworthy.

Ropes, who tells us (p. clvi) that 'Athanasius, Paul and Thomas lived together for a considerable period in the monastery of the Enaton', mentions that the style of translation in the Syriac version of the Hexapla is similar to that found in the version of the New Testament which he ascribes to Thomas of Harkel, i.e. that it follows with servility the Greek idiom and order of words, disregarding Syriac modes of expression. This fact, however, does not prove identity of authorship. This method of translation may have been in favour among Syriac translators for a considerable period.

I have now to deal with two remarkable theories which have recently been advanced about the source of the marginalia in the Acts. Whereas all previous writers had taken it for granted that they were drawn from the Greek MS. in the Enaton which Thomas claims to have 'collated', Zahn and Ropes attempt to show that they come not from a Greek, but from a Syriac source.

Zahn, who does not accept Bernstein's view that the text was the work of Thomas, is of opinion that the critical signs in the Acts refer to the readings of the Enaton MS., which Thomas describes as 'very correct'. This, he says, can only have been a MS. of the *B* type. The marginalia in his view must have been drawn by Thomas from an old Syriac MS. which Thomas had by him. He says[1] with some complacency, 'We are thus freed from the incredible supposition that Thomas, at the beginning of the seventh century, would commend as very correct and careful a MS. belonging to a monastery in Alexandria which agreed not with *B*, but with *D* and the oldest Latin tradition in the most striking readings.'

This argument is entirely *a priori* and is easily refuted. If the Enaton MS. used by Thomas in the Acts was one of the *B* type and the critical signs refer to its readings, we should expect to find *B* readings embedded in the

[1] *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 219.

text with a prefixed asterisk. As a matter of fact, however, they are conspicuous by their absence, both from the asterisked passages and from the body of the text. The idea that Thomas drew supplements in Acts from a Syriac MS. appears to be founded upon the references to the 'old Syriac MS. of Mar-Xenaia' which is mentioned in his notes to Evv. There is no reference to any such MS. in the notes to Acts, and there is no reason to suppose that it contained anything besides Evv. If the critical signs in Acts refer to the readings of a single MS. belonging to the *B* type, to what do they refer in Evv., where he used not one MS., but two or three or possibly more, apparently differing in type? The 'incredible supposition' which Zahn desires to eliminate will be dealt with shortly.

In Ropes's discussion a leading part is played by a novel interpretation which he puts upon the Syriac word which is rendered by *collatus est* (= ἀντεβλήθη, ἐξισώθη). He says that the verb means 'was made like, compared, collated', and 'refers to the construction of the text, not to the apparatus, of which the subscription gives no definite explanation'. This, he says, 'corresponds to the regular use of ἀντεβλήθη by Greek scribes' (p. clxxiii). He holds, therefore, that Thomas used the Enaton MS. to construct his text, not as a source for variants, and that it was an ordinary Greek MS. of the type current at the time, i.e. a mixed MS. of the δ class. This is an improvement on Zahn's suggestion that a MS. of the *B* type was used for this purpose, since there are abundant traces of δ in the text, while there are none of *B*.

Having rejected the ascription of the marginalia to the Enaton MS., Ropes has to find another source for them. His solution is that they are Philoxenian readings, i.e. that Thomas found them in the version of Polycarp, did not approve of them, and relegated them to the margin. His final conclusion is that while Polycarp made his translation from a Greek text, either completely 'Western' or of a mixed type (= δ), converting it into free and idiomatic Syriac, Thomas revised it with the aid of 'Antiochian' MSS., 'putting in the margin or marking with an asterisk some of the Syriac renderings' (p. clxxvii). It would appear from this sentence that he considers the asterisked passages as well as the marginalia to represent discarded Philoxenian readings.

As Ropes, with Gwynn, considers the Philoxeniana to be lost, with the exception of the four minor Epistles preserved in the Pococke sylloge, he is, of course, at liberty to ascribe to it anything which he pleases. If it is not lost, his speculations are purely fanciful.

If the Acts stood alone, Ropes's explanation of *collatus est* (ἀντεβλήθη, ἐξισώθη), though forced, would be possible. Such statements may mean much, or they may mean little. The writer may mean that he constructed his text with the help of another MS., or that he extracted variants from that MS. If variants actually occur in the margin of the MS. which he wrote, there can be little doubt that the second interpretation is correct.

One thing is certain, viz. that *collatus est* must have the same meaning both in Evv. and Acts. In Evv. this meaning is beyond dispute. In his colophon Thomas states that he 'collated' the text with his two (or three) Greek MSS., and in the marginalia he refers to the readings of his two (or three) Greek MSS., together with those of his old Syriac MS. The marginalia form an

apparatus criticus. In the Acts he states that he had one Greek MS. with which he 'collated' the text. As he had only one authority, it was not necessary for him to quote it continually in his notes. Accordingly, he only once says *non est hic in Graeco* (ix. 4), referring to an asterisked reading in Polycarp's translation which was not in his own Greek MS.

The appearance of the Michigan papyrus has dealt a death-blow to both these theories. We now know that in the fourth (or third) century, a Greek text was current in Egypt which resembled most closely *D*, the MS. of Thomas (*c. Th.*) and other representatives of the *Z* group. Why should not a copy of this text have survived in the Enaton? Why should not Thomas have thought it very correct? Was there ever a scholar who did not think well of his own MS., especially if it contained remarkable readings? Did not Bede think *E* very correct? The infiltration of *Z* variants into MSS. of the Vulgate, such as the Book of Armagh, cent. ix, shows how extraordinarily attractive they were felt to be.

All the ingenious but far-fetched theories of recent writers which I have been considering have one characteristic in common, viz. that they are not founded on the colophons. As they recede from them, the subject becomes more and more intricate and the darkness more complete. To obtain light we must go back to the colophons.

NOTE

The views which I have set forth in this article were arrived at in the course of a long inquiry, and were stated by me very briefly in *J.T.S.* xxix (1927), p. 19. At that time I was under the impression that I was alone in my conclusions. When, however, my article had been written out in its final form after several revisions, I received from Prof. Lake a copy of his recent work on the Caesarean text of the Gospel of Mark,[1] in which there is an Excursus by Mrs. Silva New (pp. 376–95) upon 'the Harclean Version of the Gospels'. To my pleasure and surprise I find that she has arrived at conclusions similar to my own upon the chief points in dispute. She takes the colophons literally, looks on the translation as Philoxenian, and rejects the theory that it was revised by Thomas of Harkel. On p. 376 there is a note by Ropes in which he refers to the bearing of the Excursus upon 'certain assumptions made without adequate discussion' in his own edition. As my own article was the result of much labour, and contains many minute details, I have made no alterations in it, but send it to the Press in the form in which it was written.

[1] *Harvard Theological Review*, xxi, no. 4, Oct. 1928, pp. 207–404.

Sahidic (𝔈).

Until recently we were dependent upon the edition of C. G. Woide (1799) for our knowledge of the Sahidic version of the New Testament. This is now superseded by that of the Rev. G. Horner, the sixth volume of which, containing Acts, appeared in 1922. The great antiquity of this version is well known. The oldest MS. in which it is found, *Mus. Brit. Orient.* 7594, appears to have been written not much later than A.D. 300 and belongs to an earlier period than any Greek MS. of the N.T., with the possible exception of the Michigan papyrus. Where its readings differ from those of later MSS. ($𝔈^{vg}$) I call it $𝔈^{vt}$.

The Sahidic version, like the Peshitto, is a mixed text, and shows in places marks of a close connexion with *D*. Some readings seem to be derived from an ancestor arranged in *στίχοι* like those in *D*. I take first a case which is pointed out by Ropes (p. cxliii):

x. 33 *D* has:

> *εξαυτης ου[ν] επεμψα προς σε*
> *παρακαλων ελθειν προς ημας*

Here *στ*. 2 is supported by $𝔏^{p}$, $𝔖^{ph}$: *om. cett.* An old Sahidic MS. *V* (= *Vindob.*), A.D. 500, has, absurdly, *πρὸς ἡμᾶς* for *πρός σε* in *στ*. 1, omitting *στ*. 2. This, according to Ropes, 'is evidently a fragmentary survival from *παρακαλῶν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ἡμᾶς*'.

To this I add:

ii. 6 *D* has:

> *γενομενης δε της φωνης ταυτης*
> *συνηλθε το πληθος και συνεχυθη*

$𝔈^{vt}$ has *συνελθούσης* for *γενομένης* with consequential botching. The error is due to looking forward.

iv. 5 *D* has:

> *εγενετο δε επι την αυριον ημεραν*
> *συνηχθησαν οι αρχοντες και οι πρεσβυτεροι*

$𝔈^{vt}$ has *ἐγένοντο* (from *στ*. 1) for *συνήχθησαν* in *στ*. 2.

The most interesting omission of 𝔈 is xi. 23 where *D* has:

> *και παρεκαλει παντας*
> *τη προθεσει της καρδιας προσμενειν τω κω̄*

Here 𝔈 omits *τῇ προθέσει τῆς καρδίας*, passing from line to line. In view of this evidence, the following omissions possess interest:

iii. 5 *ὁ δὲ ἀτενίσας αὐτοῖς om.* $𝔈^{vt}$ (*στ*.)
vii. 19 *ἐκάκωσεν τοὺς πατέρας om.* $𝔈^{vt}$ (*στ*.)
xv. 25 *σὺν τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς ἡμῶν om.* $𝔈^{vt}$ (*στ*.)
xxi. 30 *καὶ εὐθέως ἐκλείσθησαν αἱ θύραι om.* $𝔈^{vt}$ (*στ*.)

In xxi. 40 $𝔈^{vt}$ omits *καὶ ἐπιτρέψαντος . . . πρὸς αὐτούς* (3 *στ*.).

𝔈 = *D*, *alii.*

i. 2 κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{gt}, 𝔈, *Aug. alii.* : *om. cett.* (στ.)

5 ἕως τῆς πεντηκοστῆς *D*, 𝔈, *Aug. alii.* : *om. cett.* (στ.)

9 βλεπόντων αὐτῶν *om. D*, 𝔈, *Aug.*

ib. νεφέλη ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπήρθη *D*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Aug.* : ἐπήρθη καὶ νεφ. ὑπέλαβεν αὐτόν *cett.*

ii. 14 ἀποστόλοις *D*, 𝔏^{gpt}, 𝔈^{vt} : *om. cett.*

38 τοῦ κυρίου *DE* 614, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖, 𝔈, *Cypr.* : *om. cett.*

iii. 22 πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν *DE* δ, 𝔏^{ghp}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈, *Iren.* : *om. cett.*

iv. 24 ὁ θεός *D*, *cett.* (𝔈), *Iren.* : *om.* Γ, *vg.*, *Aug.*

v. 4 ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρὸν τοῦτο *D*, 𝔈 : τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτο *cett.*

8 εἶπεν (ἔφη *E*) *DE*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : ἀπεκρίθη *cett.*

12 ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ *D*, 𝔈 : cf. *E*, 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.*

26 ἤγαγον *D* : ἦγεν (ἤγαγεν) *cett.* : *plur. tuentur* 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈

28 οὐ *D*, *cett.* (𝔈) : *om.* Γ, 𝔏^{dg} *vg.*

31 ἐν αὐτῷ *D*, 𝔏^{hp}, 𝔈, *Aug.* : *om. cett.*, *Iren.*

35 πρὸς τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ τοὺς συνεδρίους *D*, 𝔈^{vg} : cf. 𝔏^{h}, 𝔈^{vt} : πρὸς αὐτούς *cett.*

39 οὔτε ὑμεῖς οὔτε βασιλεῖς οὔτε τύραννοι *D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{ph} : cf. *E*, 𝔏^{g} : οὔτε τύραννοι ὑμῶν 𝔈^{vt} : *om. cett.*

42 τὸν κύριον *DC*, 𝔏^{ghp}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

vi. 2 πρὸς αὐτούς *D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Cypr.* : *om. cett.*

5 οὗτος *D*, 𝔏^{ght}, 𝔖, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

8 διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (*sim.*) *D* 614, 𝔏^{ghp}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

vii. 5 ἀλλά *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔈 : καί *cett.*

viii. 1 θλῖψις *D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

ib. οἳ ἔμειναν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ *D*, 𝔏^{gh}, 𝔈, *Aug.* : *om. cett.* (στ.)

x. 16 πάλιν *D* δ, 𝔏^{gp}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈^{vt} : εὐθύς *cett.* (*om.* 𝔏^{d}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈^{vg})

22 πρὸς αὐτόν *D*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

28 ἀνδρί (*post* προσερχ.) *D*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

30 νηστεύων *D*, *cett.* (𝔈) : *om.* Γ, 𝔏^{p} *vg.*

32 ὃς παραγενόμενος λαλήσει σοι *D*, *cett.* (𝔈) : *om.* Γ, 𝔏^{p2} *vg.*

33 πάντα *om. D*, 𝔈

ib. θεοῦ *D* 383, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : κυρίου *cett.*

41 ἡμέρας τεσσ. *DE*, 𝔏^{gh}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈, *Aug. Ephr.* : *om. cett.*, *Iren.*

xi. 22 διελθεῖν *D*, *cett.* (𝔈) : *om.* Γ, *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}

xii. 5 πολλή *D*, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

7 τῷ Πέτρῳ *D*, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈 : αὐτῷ 𝔖^{vg} : *om. cett.*

20 οἱ δὲ ὁμοθυμαδόν *D c.Th.*, 𝔏^{gp} *vg.*, 𝔈 : ὁμοθ. δέ *cett.*

xiii. 5 *ὑπηρετοῦντα αὐτοῖς D c. Th.*, 𝔏^{p}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : *ὑπηρέτην cett.*

14 *τῆς* Πισιδίας *D*, *cett.* (𝔈) : *τὴν* Πισιδίαν Γ

32 *ἡμῶν DE*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

ib. *τὸν* Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν *D*, 𝔈 : cf. 614, 𝔖^{ph} : Ἰησοῦν *cett.*

45 *τὸ πλῆθος D*, 𝔈 : *τοὺς ὄχλους cett.*

xiii. 46 *πρὸς αὐτούς D*, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

xiv. 10 *σοὶ λέγω ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου* Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *D*, *cett.* (𝔈) : *om.* ℵ *AB*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph} (*στ.*)

21 *τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{vg} : *ἐν τῇ πόλει* 𝔏^{dg}, 𝔈 : *τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην cett.*

25 *τὸν λόγον DB*, 𝔈 : +*τοῦ κυρίου* (*θεοῦ*) *cett.*

xv. 1 *περιπατῆτε D c.Th.*, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

2 *σὺν αὐτοῖς D*, 𝔈 : *πρὸς αὐτούς cett.*

4 *μεγάλως DC δ*, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

15 *οὕτως D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔈, *Iren.* : *τούτῳ cett.*

20 *καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλουσιν ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι ἑτέροις μὴ ποιεῖτε* (*ποιεῖν*) *D c.Ath.*, 𝔈, *Iren. alii.* : *om. cett.* (2 *στ.*)

23 *ἐπιστολήν DC δ*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

34 *ἔδοξεν δὲ τῷ* Σιλᾷ *ἐπιμεῖναι αὐτοῦ D*, *cett.* (𝔈) : *om.* ℵ *ABE*, 𝔖^{vg}

xvi. 10 *διεγερθεὶς οὖν διηγήσατο τὸ ὅραμα ἡμῖν D*, 𝔈 : *ὡς δὲ τὸ ὅραμα εἶδεν cett.*

24 *ὁ δέ D*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : *ὅς cett.*

40 *τοὺς ἀδελφούς D*, *cett.* (𝔈) : *om.* Γ

xvii. 17 *τοῖς ἐν D c.Th. δ*, 𝔈 : *ἐν cett.*

20 *ῥήματα DE*, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

21 *εἰς αὐτούς D*, 𝔈 (?) : *ἐκεῖ* 𝔖 : *om. cett.*

xviii. 12 *καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας D*, 𝔏^{h}, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈 : *om. cett.* (*στ.*)

17 *οἱ* Ἕλληνες *D*, *cett.* (𝔈) : *om.* Γ, *vg.*

21 *ἀνακάμψω D*, 𝔈 : *πάλιν ἀνακάμψω cett.*

26 Ἀκύλας *καὶ* Πρίσκιλλα *D*, *cett.* (𝔈) : Πρίσκιλλα *καὶ* Ἀκύλας Γ *E*

xix. 2 *λαμβάνουσίν τινες D c.Th.*, 𝔈 : *ἐστιν cett.*

5 Χριστοῦ *D δ*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, 𝔈 : *om.* Γ *E*, *vg.*

20 *ἐνίσχυσεν . . . καὶ ηὔξανεν καὶ ἐπληθύνετο D* : 'grew and was established and prevailed' 𝔈 : *ηὔξανεν καὶ ἴσχυεν cett.*

25 *οὗτος D* 614, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, 𝔈 : *οὓς cett.*

ib. *συντεχνῖται D*, 𝔖^{ph}, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

37 *ἐνθάδε D c.Th.*, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

xx. 15 *καὶ μείναντες ἐν* Τρωγυλίᾳ *D δ*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, 𝔈 : *om.* Γ *E*, *vg.* (*στ.*)

18 *ἀδελφοί D*, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

23 *ἐν* Ἱεροσολύμοις *D*, 𝔏^{g} *vg.*, 𝔖, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

25 τοῦ Ἰησοῦ *D*, 𝔈 : τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: τοῦ θεοῦ *E* δ, *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om.* Γ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$

31 ὑμῶν *D*, *cett.* (𝔈) : *om.* Γ

xxi. 1 καὶ Μύρα *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

20 ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, 𝔈 : Ἰουδαίων δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις *cett.* (*om.* א, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$)

24 ἀλλ' ὅτι *D*, 𝔈 : ἀλλά *cett.*

25 οὐδὲν ἔχουσι λέγειν πρὸς σέ *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, 𝔈 : *om. cett.* (στ.)

40 τοῦ χιλιάρχου *D*, 𝔈 : αὐτοῦ *cett.*

xxii. 9 καὶ ἔμφοβοι ἐγένοντο *DE* δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, 𝔈 : *om.* Γ, *vg.*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ (στ.)

11 ἀνέστην *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{dg}$ (*def. D*), 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

25 ἔξεστιν ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπον Ῥωμαῖον καὶ ἀκατάκριτον *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, 𝔈 : ἄνθρ. Ῥωμ. καὶ ἀκατάκριτον ἔξεστιν ὑμῖν *cett.*

26 ὅρα *D* 383, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

It may be worth while to add some agreements of 𝔈 with allies of *D* in those parts of Acts where *D* is not extant.

ix. 20 τῶν Ἰουδαίων $\mathfrak{L}^{hp}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, 𝔈, *spec.* : *om. cett.*

30 διὰ νυκτός *E* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, 𝔖, 𝔈 : *om.* Γ

40 παραχρῆμα *E*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, 𝔈, *spec.* : *om. cett.*

xxii. 29 καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔλυσεν αὐτόν 614, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

xxiii. 9 μὴ θεομαχῶμεν δ, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

15 ἐρωτῶμεν ὑμᾶς ἵνα τοῦτο ἡμῖν ποιήσητε *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

ib. συναγαγόντες τὸ συνέδριον *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

ib. ἐμφανίσατε τῷ χιλιάρχῳ *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, 𝔈 : petite a tribuno $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: ὑμεῖς ἐμφαν. τῷ χιλ. σὺν τῷ συνεδρίῳ *cett.*

23 ἑκατόν *c.Th.* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, 𝔈 : ἑβδομήκοντα *cett.*

xxiv. 22 ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα δ, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

23 ὑπηρετεῖν] + ἢ προσέρχεσθαι δ, 𝔈

26 ὅπως λύσῃ αὐτόν δ, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

xxv. 16 εἰς ἀπώλειαν δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, 𝔖, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

xxvii. 19 εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

34 πεσεῖται δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, 𝔈 : ἀπολεῖται Γ, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$

35 ἐπιδιδοὺς καὶ ἡμῖν 614, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

39 οἱ ναῦται $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

xxviii. 16 ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης παρέδωκεν τοὺς δεσμίους τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῃ δ, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, 𝔈 : *om. cett.*

There are some notable agreements between 𝔈 and $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$:

vii. 2 ἔφη] ἀπεκρίθη $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: ἀποκριθεὶς ἔφη 𝔈

57 κράξαντες δέ] tunc populus exclamavit $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, 𝔈

viii. 1 διωγμὸς μέγας καὶ θλῖψις *D*: θλῖψις καὶ διωγμὸς μέγας 𝕷^h, 𝕰: διωγμὸς μέγας *cett.*

ix. 20 ὁ Χριστός 𝕷^h, 𝕰, *Iren.*, *spec.*: *om. cett.*

xiv. 9 ἀτενίσας δὲ αὐτῷ *D*: ἠτένισεν αὐτῷ 𝕷^h, 𝕰: ὃς ἀτενίσας αὐτῷ *cett.*

20 ἑσπέρας γενομένης 𝕷^h, 𝕰, *Ephr.*: *om. cett.* (*D*)

xviii. 19 τῷ ἐπιόντι σαββάτῳ 𝕷^h, 𝕰: κἀκείνους κατέλιπεν ἐκεῖ Γ, *cett.*: καὶ (*om.* 𝕾^{ph}) τῷ ἐπιόντι σαββ. ἐκείνους (κἀκ. 𝕾^{ph}) κατέλιπεν ἐκεῖ *D*, 𝕾^{ph}

xxiii. 8 τὰ ἀμφότερα] εἶναι ἀνάστασιν καὶ ἄγγελον καὶ πνεῦμα 𝕷^h, 𝕰

18 τὸν νεανίαν 𝕷^h, 𝕾^{vg}, 𝕰: αὐτόν *cett.*

xxvii. 6 εἰς αὐτό *om.* 𝕷^h, 𝕰

The most remarkable of these variants is xxiii. 8, where a common interpolation occurs.

There is a striking agreement between 𝕷^p and 𝕰 in xiii. 4: οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου] egressi igitur a sanctis 𝕷^p: 'when they had been dispatched by those who are holy' 𝕰. The reading of 𝕷^p seems to imply a reading ἐξελθόντες for ἐκπεμφθέντες, while 𝕰 combines ἐκπεμφθ. with ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων.

Other cases are:

iv. 24 πάντες *post* φωνήν 𝕷^p, *post* οἱ δέ 𝕰: *om. cett.*

viii. 4 κατὰ τὰς πόλεις καὶ κώμας τῆς Ἰουδαίας 𝕷^p: κατὰ τὰς πόλεις 𝕰: *om. cett.* (*D*)

36 εὐνοῦχος] + τῷ Φιλίππῳ 𝕷^p, 𝕰

ix. 34 ἀτενίσας δὲ εἰς αὐτὸν ὁ Πέτρος 𝕷^p, 𝕰: *om. cett.*

35 οἵτινες] καί 𝕷^p, 𝕾^{vg}: καὶ πάντες 𝕰

The most important of these is ix. 34.

The agreements of 𝕰 with 𝕷^g are less striking. The chief case is i. 2, where 𝕷^g (also 𝕷^t), 𝕰 have the same dislocation of the words οὓς ἐξελέξατο (after εὐαγγέλιον). Minor examples are:

iv. 13 ἀγράμματοί εἰσιν καὶ ἰδιῶται] ἰδιῶταί εἰσιν καὶ ἀγράμματοι 𝕷^g, 𝕰 (*om.* καὶ ἰδιῶται *D*)

30 ἴασιν] ἰάσεις 𝕷^g, 𝕰

31 παρρησίας] + πάσης 𝕷$^{gp^2}$, 𝕰

vii. 38 τοῦ ἀγγέλου] *om.* 𝕷^g, 𝕰, *Bl.*

xiii. 38 διὰ τούτου] + τοῦ Ἰησοῦ 𝕷^g, 𝕰

xviii. 11 ἐν Κορίνθῳ *D*, 𝕷^h, 𝕾: ἐκεῖ 𝕷^g, 𝕰: *om. cett.*

xxi. 36 αὐτόν] τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἡμῶν 𝕷^g, 𝕰

xxvi. 4 τὴν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς] *om.* 𝕷^g, 𝕰

xxvii. 41 ἐρείσασα] *om.* 𝕷^g, 𝕰

These agreements between 𝕰 and the Latin MSS. resemble those given by a similar analysis of 𝕾^{vg}, and show that Greek MSS. containing these readings were current in Egypt as well as in Mesopotamia.

In two of the examples given above (xxiii. 18, ix. 35) 𝔖^{vg} is found in combination with 𝔈 and Latin MSS. Examples of agreement between 𝔈 and 𝔖^{vg} (or 𝔖) are:

v. 18 δημοσίᾳ] *om.* 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈, *Luc.*
viii. 7 ἐξήρχοντο] + ἀπ' αὐτῶν 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈
10 καλουμένη] *om.* 383, 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈
xv. 7 ἐν ὑμῖν] *om.* 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈
xxii. 28 δὲ καί] + ἐν αὐτῇ 𝔖, 𝔈
xxiii. 6 καὶ ἀναστάσεως] τῆς ἀναστάσεως 𝔖, 𝔈^{vt}
xxv. 6 οὐ πλείους] *om.* 𝔖, 𝔈
xxviii. 4 πρὸς ἀλλήλους *om.* 𝔖^{vg}, 𝔈

I have not included a large number of cases where a demonstrative pronoun, omitted in Greek, is added after a verb, since such insertions are demanded by Sahidic as well as by Syriac idiom.

NOTES

CHAPTER I

I. 2. In this passage there appear to have been two early variants, viz. ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας κ.τ.λ. and ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ κ.τ.λ. The first of these, which is found in Γ *E* δ and sundry other authorities, refers to the day of the Ascension; the second, which may be ascribed to *Z*, though the chief representatives of *Z* have been interpolated from the rival family, refers to the day when the Apostles were first chosen. (Cf. Lk. vi. 13 ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν.)

The second variant, as was pointed out by Corssen,[1] is found, in a pure form, in *Aug.*[ab], viz. ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐξελέξατο διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἐκέλευσεν κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. This is supported by two quotations in the tract *contra Varimadum* (i. 31 and iii. 71), attributed to Vigil, and by an allusion in the Epistle of Barnabas, ascribed to the early part of cent. ii A.D., which in v. 2 has the words ὅτε τοὺς ἰδίους ἀποστόλους τοὺς μέλλοντας κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτοῦ ἐξελέξατο.

The confusion caused by these variants may be seen from the fact that *Aug.*[c] adopts ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας from Γ, while otherwise conforming with *Aug.*[ab]. Ephrem appears to combine them in a curious note:

'Quando coepit facere? A baptismo Iohannis. Et quando iterum finivit? In quo die iussit apostolos in Galilaea annuntiare evangelium.'

The nearest approach to the reading of *Aug.*[ab] is to be found in 𝔏[gt], which give the equivalent of ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας ἐνετείλατο τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον οὓς ἐξελέξατο. This represents a conflation of the two strains without ἀνελήμφθη. The collocation of οὓς ἐξελέξατο at the end of the sentence is very remarkable. It is to be noticed that the same order occurs in the Sahidic (𝔈), which has also incorporated ἀνελήμφθη from Γ.

D and *c.Th.* agree exactly, except that *c.Th.* places οὓς ἐξελέξατο before διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου. They have been harmonized with Γ by the adoption of ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας and the addition of ἀνελήμφθη in a different collocation (after ἡμέρας instead of at the end of the sentence), with the consequential alteration ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις οὓς ἐξελέξατο for the original τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐξελέξατο of *Aug.*[ab]. With these alien elements they combine the rest of the *Z* reading καὶ ἐκέλευσεν κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, omitted by Γ.

With regard to these variants it may be observed that the substitution of ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας for ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ is prima facie more probable than the reverse process, in view of the context and the occurrence in *v.* 22 of the words ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος Ἰωάννου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς ἀνελήμφθη.

Ropes, who accepts the reading of *Aug.*[ab] as original, thinks that the

[1] *Der Cyprianische Text der Acta* (1892), p. 19.

reading of Γ, *cett.* is due to what he euphemistically terms 'the innocent desire of a very early editor to introduce here a mention of the Ascension' (p. 259).

5. Ἰωάννης, Ἰωάνης.

It was observed by Hort that the spelling Ἰωάνης is almost always used in *B*, while in ℵ it is found 'only in parts written by the scribe of *B*',[1] who was supposed by Tischendorf to have written most of the N.T. in ℵ, a view which is emphatically contradicted by Lake. Hort says that it is frequent in *D*. Lippelt, a pupil of Blass, pointed out that Ἰωάνης is characteristic of *D* in Lk. and Acts. Some persons have supposed that this indicates a previous order in an ancestor of *D*, in which Lk. came immediately before Acts. Statistics have been given by Nestle, *Einführung*, p. 175, n. 2, and von Soden, pp. 1307, 2100. Von Soden (p. 1307) made a serious error in saying that there were 8 exx. of Ἰωάνης in Acts out of 18 cases. Nestle pointed out that there are really 21 exx. out of 23. The correction was made by von Soden later on (p. 2100), who retorted by pointing out errors in Nestle's lists.

My own figures agree closely with von Soden's revised list, viz.:

Ἰωάνης in Mt., 2 exx. (ix. 14; xiv. 2).
Jn., 7 exx. (v. 36; x. 40, 41 *bis*; xxi. 15, 16, 17).
Lk., 28 exx. (i. 13, 60, 63; iii. 2, 15, 20; v. 10, 33; vi. 14; vii. 18, 20, 22, 24 *bis*, 27, 29, 33; viii. 51; ix. 9, 19, 28, 49, 54; xi. 1; xvi. 16; xx. 4, 6; xxii. 8).
Mk., 2 exx. (i. 29; vi. 25).
Acts, 21 exx. (i. 5, 13, 22; iii. 1, 3, 4, 11; iv. 13, 19; viii. 14; x. 37; xii. 2, 12, 25; xiii. 13, 24, 25; xv. 37; xviii. 25; xix. 3, 4).

To these should be added 2 exx. of Ἰωάνα, both in Lk. (viii. 3; xxiv. 10).

The combined figures for the two types are:

	Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.	Acts
Ἰωάννης	21	5	1	23	2
Ἰωάνης (Ἰωάνα)	2	7	30	2	21
	23	12	31	25	23

The references for -νν- in Lk. and Acts are Lk. ix. 7; Acts xi. 16; xiii. 5.

I now come to cases of *Iohanes* (-*ana*) in 𝔏[d], viz.:

Mt.	Jn.	Lk.	Mk.	Acts
0	3	27	1	1

In Lk. *Iohanes* in 𝔏[d] agrees with Ἰωάνης in *D* in all cases except vii. 20, 24 (*semel*); xx. 6. This is a very remarkable fact. In Acts, on the other hand, 𝔏[d] has only 1 example of *Iohanes* (iii. 1) as against 21 of Ἰωάνης in *D*. The references to Jn. are x. 40; xxi. 16, 17, where *D* has -ν-. The single example in Mk. (vi. 20) is not supported by *D*.

The only example of *Iohanes* which I have observed in any other O.-L. MS. occurs in 𝔏[k] (Evv.) which has 1 case of *Iohanes* (Mt. xi. 7) as against 23 of *Iohannes*.

[1] The only examples of Ἰωάνης in ℵ, in Evv. and Acts, if Tischendorf's transcript is correct, are Mt. xvi. 14; xvii. 1, 13; Lk. i. 13.

18. In this important passage *Aug.*[b] (*Aug.*[a] does not contain i. 9–26) appears to have preserved a στίχος lost by all existing MSS. It will be seen that it comes at the end of a στίχος in *D* and its loss is explained by ὁμ. For another case where all MSS. seem to have lost a στίχος cf. xiii. 29. Ephrem on Diatessaron (p. 240 Mösinger) says of Judas that he hanged himself and that, when the rope was cut, he fell down and burst asunder in the middle. He also mentions another story that Judas hanged himself in a shed the door of which he had bolted and there rotted before his body was discovered. Theophylactus, who professes to quote Papias, the disciple of John, ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ τῆς ἐξηγήσεως τῶν Κυριακῶν λόγων, says that Judas became horribly swollen (πρησθείς), so that he could not enter where a waggon had passed, and adds revolting details. It has been proposed to read πρησθεὶς for πρηνὴς or to suppose that πρηνὴς can mean 'swollen', which is impossible.

It may be argued that the reading of *Aug.*[b] is a supplement inserted to harmonize the passage with Mt. xxvii. 5 καὶ ἀπελθὼν ἀπήγξατο, and that the writer of Acts is following a different tradition, as in the same verse he makes Judas buy a field with the money he had received, whereas according to Mt. he brought it back to the High Priests. On the other hand, the sense of the ordinary reading 'And falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst' is, to say the least, very mysterious. The word πρηνὴς is perfectly natural if used of a person who jumped headlong from a height. Strack-Billerbeck[1] refer to a Jewish story of a man who fell from a roof to the ground, with the result that his bowels gushed out. A passer-by fetched the son of the dying man and slew him before his father's eyes, who swooning drew a deep sigh, whereupon his bowels went back into their place, and his body was stitched up by a surgeon (*man nähte ihm den Leib zu*).

CHAPTER II

II. 5–11. The ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς mentioned in *v.* 5 are pious Jews from the διασπορά who were then living in Jerusalem. The addition of Ἰουδαῖοι after κατοικοῦντες in all MSS. except ℵ is somewhat comic. 'In Jerusalem there were living Jews.' Who else should be living there? The sense is greatly improved by the excision of the word. In *v.* 9 Ἰουδαίαν cannot be right. Not only is the mention of Judaea absurd in this context, but the geographical order is very odd. We should expect some country contiguous to Mesopotamia and Cappadocia to be mentioned here. An excellent sense is given by Ἀρμενίαν (*Aug.*[a] *Tert.*), but the agreement of *Aug.*[b] with the ordinary reading suggests that it is an ancient conjecture. There is much also to be said for Jerome's Συρίαν (on Isaiah iv. 163). The conjecture Ἰδουμαίαν, mentioned by Tischendorf, appears to have been made by Barth. The reading Ἰουδαῖοι found in $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ and *Aug.*[c] is interesting in view of Ἰουδαῖοι in *vv.* 5 and 10: also the omission of Ἰουδαίαν by Eusebius.

The impression which the variants in these verses make upon me is that the confusion has been caused by a very ancient note Ἰουδαῖοι placed in the margin, to show that the ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς in *v.* 5 were Jews by religion, though by race

[1] *Commentar z. N.T.*, vol. 2 (1924), p. 595.

or residence they were Parthians, Medes, &c. The corruption Ἰουδαίαν in *v.* 9 may be due to the intrusion of a similar variant (Ἰουδαῖοι) into the context which took the place of Συρίαν or Ἀρμενίαν, and was then altered to Ἰουδαίαν, or Ἰουδαίαν may have been substituted for the missing word and altered to Ἰουδαῖοι in 𝔖vg and *Aug.*c. It is not necessary to suppose that the lost word resembled Ἰουδαίαν. If so, Συρίαν fits the context better than any other suggestion. It is perhaps worth noticing that in the Epistle of Barnabas ix. 6, where the words πᾶς Σύρος καὶ Ἄραψ occur, the Old-Latin translation renders by *Iudaeus et Arabs*.

Attention has already been drawn (p. lxii, n.) to the rendering of καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες in *v.* 10 by *qui hic demorantur* in 𝔏d (*advenae* 𝔏gp, *peregrinantes* 𝔏e: *qui advenerant Aug.*ac, *qui aderant Aug.*b). This translation is singular, but hardly enough to show connexion with Jerusalem.

41–7. In these verses there are many interesting corruptions, chiefly 'roving variants', i.e. v.l.s placed differently in various authorities. In *v.* 41 *D* places πιστεύσαντες after μὲν οὖν while *c.Th.*, *vg.*, *Aug.*c put καὶ πιστεύσαντες after λόγον αὐτοῦ: *om. cett.* (For the fusion of στίχοι in *D* cf. p. xxxv.) In *v.* 42 *D* has ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, so 𝔏t after προσευχαῖς, while many authorities place the words in *v.* 43 after ἐγίνετο. A minor complication, also in *v.* 42, is that ὁμοθυμαδόν is added by 614 after προσκαρτεροῦντες, while 𝔏p, *vg.*qw add it (*praem.* προσκαρτεροῦντες) after προσευχαῖς. In *v.* 43 after ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, placed after ἐγίνετο by many authorities (cf. *supr.*), ℵ*AC* add φόβος τε ἦν μέγας ἐπὶ πάντας which appears to be a variant for ἐγένετο δὲ πάσῃ ψυχῇ φόβος at the beginning of the verse. In *v.* 45 after ἐπίπρασκον 𝔏p, *vg.*qw add καὶ ἐτίθουν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων (= iv. 34). In the same verse *D*, 𝔏gp have καθ' ἡμέραν after αὐτά, while Γ, *cett.* place the words at the beginning of *v.* 46 for πάντες (*D*). In *v.* 46 ὁμοθυμαδόν (cf. *v.* 42), which Γ, *cett.* have after, or before, ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, is omitted by *D*. In *v.* 47 there appear to be two variants, viz. ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (cf. *v.* 44) and ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. The second of these variants is found in 𝔖vg, while *D* combines it with the first (= Γ).

Reference has already been made (p. 183) to the strange corruption in *D*, *v.* 46 κατ οικουσαν επι το αυτο (κατ' οἶκον *cett.*) where the scribe has looked forward to καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό in *v.* 47.

It would require considerable space to record all the doublets and roving variants of this kind in Acts. Attention may be called to cases which occur in ii. 5–11; iv. 10–12, 25; vii. 3–4; ix. 4, 5; xiv. 20; xv. 5.

CHAPTER III

III. 14. For βαρύνειν (-νεσθαι) τινα in the sense of treating a person hardly or being angry with him we may compare Plut. *Thes.* 32 παρώξυνε πάλαι βαρυνομένους τὸν Θησέα: Dio Chrys. 40. 1 ἐμὲ δὲ ὑπώπτευον· τὸ γὰρ ἀληθὲς εἰρήσεται· βαρύνεσθαί τινας ὡς ξένον καὶ περιττόν: pap. Oxy. 298, 25–7 περὶ Ἑρμοδώρου γράφεις μοι λίαν αὐτὸν βαρύνομαι (= that I am too severe upon him): Dittenberger, *Or. Gr.* ii. 669, § 3 ἵνα δὲ μηδαμόθεν βαρύνῃ τὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους συναλλαγάς.

For *gravo*, *aggravor* in this sense cf. Sirach, xxv. 3 *tres species odivit anima mea et aggravor valde animae illorum.*

CHAPTER IV

IV. 6. For Ἰωνάθας (*D*, cf. 𝔏gp) compare Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 4. 3 (§ 95) τὸν ἀρχιερέα Ἰώσηπον τὸν καὶ Καϊάφαν ἐπικαλούμενον ἀπαλλάξας τῆς ἱερωσύνης Ἰωνάθην καθίστησιν Ἀνάνου τοῦ ἀρχιερέως υἱόν. Jerome, *de nominibus Hebraicis*, gives (under Acts) *Ionatha, columba dans, sive columba veniens.* Blass remarks *hoc* (= Ἰωνάθας) *si scripserat Lucas, insolitum nomen facile per imprudentiam librarii abibat in solitum* Ἰωάνης; *non facile autem, si ab auctore* Ἰωάνης *scriptum erat, pro eo substituebatur nomen a toto N.T. alienum* (p. 35). Ropes here approves of Ἰωνάθας as against Ἰωάννης. For other agreements between *D* and Josephus cf. v. 37 (μέγαν and πολύν); xii. 23; xiii. 8 (Ἑτοιμᾶς), 20–1.

10–12. In these verses great confusion has been caused by two rival variants, viz. (1) καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενί, and (2) ἐν ἄλλῳ δὲ οὐδενί. The first of these is found in Γ, *cett.* (*D*) at the end of *v.* 11, after γωνίας. The second is found in *c.Th.*, 𝔏h, and Cyprian at the end of *v.* 10 after ὑγιής, also in a slightly modified form (καὶ ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενί) in *E*. It is clear that a στίχος has been transposed by one or other set of authorities.

Since *D*, except for one point (*om.* ἡ σωτηρία), agrees with Γ in these verses, the probability is that it has been harmonized with Γ, while *c.Th.*, 𝔏h have preserved the *Z* reading. It may be noticed that the words ἐν ἄλλῳ δέ come neatly after ἐν τούτῳ in *v.* 10.

A second point is concerned with the genuineness of the words ἡ σωτηρία, which in Γ come after καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενί, but are omitted by *D*, 𝔏hp (*c.Th.* is not quoted). On the one hand, it is easy to suppose that *D*, 𝔏hp have dropped a στίχος, but on the other, ἡ σωτηρία seems pleonastic before ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς.

Irenaeus omits ἐν ἄλλῳ δὲ οὐδενί in *v.* 10, and in *v.* 12, where *D* has

> και ουκ εστιν εν αλλω ουδενι
> ου γαρ εστιν ετερον ονομα υπο τον ουρανον

he gives καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἕτερον κ.τ.λ. (*med. om.*). Here he appears to have fused two στίχοι into one, passing from εστιν to εστιν (cf. p. xli). The conclusion suggested by these readings is that a στίχος in *v.* 10 was dropped and afterwards inserted, in a modified form, after γωνίας (*v.* 11) in Γ. As the words here come in somewhat awkwardly, ἡ σωτηρία was added to give them a construction. *D* has been harmonized with Γ, except that ἡ σωτηρία has not been added.

It is to be noticed that immediately afterwards 𝔏h transposes the words ἐπεγίνωσκον . . . ἦσαν (*v.* 13), which it places after ἀντειπεῖν (*v.* 14). Here 𝔏h is clearly wrong: cf. xiv. 9.

25. In this passage (cf. p. li) there is great confusion in the MSS. due to two roving variants, διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου and τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.

(*a*) It will be well to begin with the simplest text, found in δ, viz. ὁ διὰ στόματος Δαυὶδ παιδός σου εἰπών. Here both variants are absent.

(*b*) *D* has os (= o) δια πν̄s αγιου δια του στοματος λαλησας
δαυειδ παιδος σου

Here the words τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν are missing, but may have been contained in a third στ., now lost.

(*c*) ΓE give ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνς ἁγίου στόματος Δαυὶδ παιδός σου εἰπών. This clearly is not Greek. The collocation of τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν is impossible, and διά is required before στόματος. Hort admits the 'extreme difficulty of the text which doubtless contains a primitive error' and conjectures τοῖς πατράσιν for τοῦ πατρός, thus destroying the antithesis between τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν and παιδός σου.

(*d*) 𝔏g, 𝔈, and Irenaeus have ὁ διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου διὰ στόματος Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν παιδός σου εἰπών.

Here both the variants are present, the first (διὰ πνς ἁγίου) occupying the same position as in *D*.

(*e*) 𝔏p has ὁ διὰ στόματος τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυὶδ παιδός σου διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου εἰπών.

Here the collocation is different.

(*f*) 𝔖ph agrees with 𝔏p, except that it omits τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.

(*g*) 𝔖vg appears to agree with *D* (its reading is reported as = *tu es qui locutus es per spiritum sanctum per os Davidis, servi tui.* It would be unsafe to draw any conclusion as to the position of λαλήσας (εἰπών) here.)

(*h*) Aug. (*praedest. sanct.* 33) and Hilary give ὁ διὰ στόματος Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, ἁγίου παιδός σου, εἰπών.

It will be seen that the evidence for διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου is almost overwhelming. I am, however, much impressed by an observation of Blass, who says *inauditum est Deum per spiritum sanctum loqui, loquitur per homines vel Deus* (*ut* iii. 18) *vel spiritus sanctus* (*ut* i. 16). To these examples may be added xi. 28 (Ἄγαβος) σημαίνων διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος: xxi. 4 ἔλεγον διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. He reads with δ, except that he adopts λαλήσας from *D* before Δαυίδ, in place of εἰπών at the end. I sometimes wish that I had followed a similar course, while sometimes I regret that I did not add τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν as a third στίχος in the text.

CHAPTER V

V. 29. At the beginning of this verse the reading of *D* is obviously defective, since the statement (or question) which follows is ascribed to the High Priest (*v.* 28). It is therefore clear that *D* has dropped a στίχος which contained the words ἀποκριθεὶς . . . αὐτούς (*sim.*) found in all other authorities.

In what follows Γ, *cett.* (*D*) have a simple statement, while 𝔏gh have a longer version, proceeding by question and answer. There can be no doubt that the simple statement is a very ancient variant, since the passage is quoted thus by Polycrates (Eus. *H.E.* v. 24), Hippolytus, and Origen (Migne xiv. 1156; xv. 1227, 1284). On the other hand, the fuller form is more vivid and dramatic and therefore intrinsically superior. It also has patristic support. Augustine quotes the passage twice in an interrogative form, viz. *Litt. Petil.* ii. 187 *utrum* (= 𝔏g) *deo magis obediendum sit an hominibus*; *Crescon.* i. 11 *cui* (= 𝔏h) *obedire oportet? deo an hominibus?* So Jerome *Ruf.*, § 563 quotes *oboedire deo magis oportet an hominibus?* Lucifer, as usual, agrees with 𝔏g.

An interesting trace of this reading survives in 𝔏e, which renders ἢ ἀνθρώποις by *an hominibus.* Bede observes *interrogative legitur in Graeco.* As 𝔏e is closely connected with 𝔏g, it probably derived *an* from this source (p. 274 f.).

In *vg.*[a] there is a mixture of readings. First comes *oboedire oportet deo magis quam hominibus* (= Γ, *cett.*) with a marginal note *sub interrogatione*; then follows *at illi dixerunt deo*. A similar reading is found in *vg.*[w].

The words ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς found in *D*, 𝔏[gh] *vg.*[a], are omitted by Γ, *cett.* (στ.).

The simplest explanation of the variants here is that the abbreviator, offended by what he thought to be redundancy in the longer reading, substituted a bald statement for the question and answers, and struck out the last στίχος. *D* was harmonized with Γ, *cett.*, but retained the last στίχος. Its special omission of στ. i (ἀποκριθεὶς . . . αὐτούς) remained uncorrected.

36-7. This passage has been already discussed (p. liv) and I confine myself here as far as possible to supplementary details.

Josephus refers to Judas of Galilee in *Ant.* xviii. 1. 1 (§ 4), xx. 5. 2 (§ 102); *B. J.* ii. 8. 1 (§ 117), 17. 8 (§ 433). The chief passages are *Ant.* xviii. 1. 1 and *B. J.* ii. 8. 1, which closely resemble each other. Josephus describes the rising of Judas after the ἀπογραφή of Quirinius, and then has a long digression upon the sect of the Essenes. Nothing is said about the forces led by him, or his own fate. He simply fades out of the picture. The reference to him in *B. J.* ii. 17. 8 is of no importance. The remaining passage, *Ant.* xx. 5. 2, which contains the story of Theudas (the only reference in Josephus), has also a reference to Judas, which is of great interest in connexion with Acts.

Josephus here says (*Ant.* xx. 5. 1, §§ 97-8):

γόης τις ἀνὴρ Θευδᾶς ὀνόματι πείθει τὸν πλεῖστον ὄχλον ἀναλαβόντα τὰς κτήσεις ἕπεσθαι πρὸς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμὸν αὐτῷ· προφήτης γὰρ ἔλεγεν εἶναι, καὶ προστάγματι τὸν ποταμὸν σχίσας δίοδον ἔφη παρέξειν αὐτοῖς ῥᾳδίαν. Fadus sent a squadron (ἴλη) of cavalry against the crowd, with instant success—πολλοὺς μὲν αὐτῶν ἀνεῖλεν, πολλοὺς δὲ ζῶντας ἔλαβεν, αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν Θευδᾶν ζωγρήσαντες ἀποτέμνουσι τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ κομίζουσιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.

Theudas, unlike Judas, had a large though undisciplined force, and died a violent death on the field of battle.

Josephus goes on to describe the arrival of a new governor, Tiberius Alexander, who, among other actions, crucified the two sons of Judas, the Galilean:

πρὸς τούτοις δὲ καὶ οἱ παῖδες Ἰούδα τοῦ Γαλιλαίου ἀνηρέθησαν, τοῦ τὸν λαὸν ἀπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἀποστήσαντος Κυρινίου τῆς Ἰουδαίας τιμητεύοντος, ὡς ἐν τοῖς πρὸ τούτων ἐδηλώσαμεν, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Σίμων, οὓς ἀνασταυρῶσαι προσέταξεν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος.

Eusebius, *H.E.* ii. 11, after quoting from Acts ἀνέστη Θευδᾶς λέγων ἑαυτὸν εἶναί τινα, ὃς κατελύθη καὶ πάντες ὅσοι ἐπείσθησαν αὐτῷ διελύθησαν, goes on to say φέρε καὶ τὴν περὶ τούτου παραθώμεθα τοῦ Ἰωσήπου γραφήν. He then quotes from Josephus the passage describing the action of Fadus (xx. 5. 2), without comment of any kind upon the conflict between Josephus and Acts.

Various explanations have been offered, viz.:

(*a*) There were two persons named Theudas, the first of whom came before Judas. The Theudas mentioned by Josephus may have been his son.

(*b*) The text of Josephus has been interpolated from Acts by a Christian scribe, who substituted the name of Theudas for that of some other Jewish insurgent.

(*c*) The author of Acts had before him the text of Josephus xx. 5. 2 (§ 102), where the crucifixion of Jacob and Simon, the sons of Judas, by order of Tiberius Alexander, is mentioned after the story of Theudas. Owing to carelessness or a loss of memory he reversed the order of Theudas and Judas.

This ingenious theory was first suggested in 1873 by Holtzmann, who put his point quite briefly.[1] Later on Krenkel developed it at length in a volume dealing with supposed echoes and imitations of Josephus in Acts.[2] Schürer pointed out in 1877 that, if Holtzmann's theory was true, the author of Acts would appear to have read only one page of Josephus and to have neglected the other passages where the revolt of Judas is described; also, that he must have read this particular page very carelessly.[3] It is difficult to reconcile such negligence with Krenkel's contention that he was thoroughly familiar with the vocabulary and idiom of Josephus.

The variants in *D*, though few in number, are of considerable importance (cf. p. lv), especially *αὐτὸς δι' αὐτοῦ* in *v.* 36. I have recently observed some significant remarks of Blass, who says of Judas, *Tacet de eius exitu Josephus*. He also remarks that *διελύθησαν* and *ἐγένοντο εἰς οὐδέν*—which according to the usual arrangement refer to the followers of Theudas—are used *apte de secta quae paullatim dilabitur*, *minus apte de multitudine per vim disiecta*. It may be added that Krenkel (p. 170), who notices the discrepancy between the 400 followers attributed to Theudas in Acts and the *πλεῖστος ὄχλος* of Josephus, resorts to the explanation that there were 400 men + women and children. I venture to think that if this passage of Acts had occurred in any classical author the transposition which I have made would have been suggested long ago in view of the internal evidence. That the writer of Acts was well acquainted with the history of the time is shown by his reference (xi. 28) to the famine under Claudius, which according to Josephus took place under the procuratorship of Tiberius Alexander (*Ant.* xx. 5. 2, § 101).

CHAPTER VII

VII. 2-4. According to Gen. xi. 31-2; xii. 1-5, Terah went with Abraham from Ur to Haran, and died there. After his death Abraham received the call and departed from Haran to Canaan. According, however, to Gen. xv. 7 Abraham after settling at Hebron had a vision in which God said to him, 'I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees' (not 'out of Haran'). This tradition survives in Jos. *Ant.* i. 7. 1 (§ 154) *καὶ καταλείπει τὴν Χαλδαίαν ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε γεγονὼς ἔτη τοῦ Θεοῦ κελεύσαντος εἰς τὴν Χαναναίαν μετελθεῖν*: also in Philo, *de migratione Abr.* § 32 *πρότερον μὲν ἐκ τῆς Χαλδαϊκῆς ἀναστὰς γῆς Ἀβραὰμ ᾤκησεν εἰς Χαρράν· τελευτήσαντος δὲ αὐτῷ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖθε καὶ ἐκ ταύτης μετανίσταται.* Stephen here follows this tradition against Gen. xi-xii. That ancient readers were puzzled by the discrepancy between Acts and Gen. is shown by the discussion in Aug. *Civ. D.* xvi. 16, where he endeavours to reconcile the two accounts.

[1] *Zeitsch. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1873, p. 89.
[2] *Josephus u. Lucas*, 1894.
[3] *Zeitsch. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1876, p. 575.

Irenaeus has a shorter version of *vv.* 2–4, which for purpose of comparison with *D* I arrange in στίχοι corresponding to those in *D*:

deus gloriae visus est patri nostro
abrahae et dixit ad eum
exi de terra tua et de cognatione tua
et veni in terram quam demonstrabo tibi.
et transtulit illum in terram hanc
quam nunc et vos inhabitatis.

Here we have six στίχοι in place of eleven in *D*. This result is reached by the omission of ὄντι ἐν τῇ . . . ἐν Χαρράν in *v.* 2 and of τότε Ἀβραάμ . . . τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ (3 στ.) in *v.* 4. It will be seen that in *D* the words ἐν Χαρράν at the end of *v.* 2 come under Ἀβραάμ higher up. It is therefore likely that the scribe looked forward from -άμ to -άν and omitted the intervening passage. It is to be noted that the three lines τότε Ἀβραάμ . . . τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ are omitted by 𝔏^{p}, as well as by Irenaeus.

Blass was of opinion that Irenaeus, partially supported by 𝔏^{p}, preserves the original reading, while all other authorities are interpolated. It is, however, simpler to suppose that he was using an abbreviated text, possibly, or probably, the work of some one who wished to harmonize the passage with Gen. xi–xii by cutting out the difficulties.

Great confusion prevails in the O.-L. MSS. in these verses. 𝔏^{p}, which, as already mentioned, omits (with Irenaeus) the first three στίχοι of *v.* 4 (τότε Ἀβραάμ . . . πατέρα αὐτοῦ), substitutes *priusquam* (= πρὶν ἤ, a conjecture in place of μετὰ τό) *mortuus est pater eius* for πρὶν ἢ κατοικῆσαι αὐτόν in *v.* 2. 𝔏^{g} has a conflation of variants in *v.* 2, viz. *priusquam habitaret in Charran, priusquam mortuus est pater eius.* The climax of absurdity is reached by 𝔏^{d}, which renders πρὶν ἢ κατοικῆσαι αὐτόν (*D*) by *postea quam mortuus est* (i.e. Abraham).

CHAPTER VIII

VIII. 7. The reading of Γ here is ungrammatical (cf. p. li). To what extent this is an objection must be a matter for individual taste. Harnack calls it 'a gross, yet very natural case of anacoluthon'. A possible construction is given by πολλοῖς (*D*) or πολλῶν (δ). Before πολλοῖς there is an erasure in *D*, while 𝔏^{d} renders *a multis*. Scrivener reads π[αρ]α before πολλοῖς. Blass notes that *D*^{2} has ἀπὸ πολλοί. His own solution is to insert ἅ after ἀκάθαρτα, taking πολλοὶ γάρ with ἐθεραπεύοντο, which gives a harsh construction, though palaeographically simple.

I now return to the reading of 𝔏^{d} *a multis*. As 𝔏^{gp} *vg.* have *multi*, this rendering does not appear to have been taken from a Latin source. It may therefore be a translation of what was once in *D*. Since the text of this edition was printed I have noticed that Wetstein, no mean authority, says 'απο πολλοις *D*, *a prima manu*'. If his decipherment is correct, *D* appears to have a conflation of ἀπὸ πολλῶν (= *a multis* in 𝔏^{d}) and πολλοί (-οῖς) from Γ. The usual construction is ἐξελθεῖν ἀπό, or ἐξ, e.g. Mt. xvii. 18 ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ δαιμόνιον: Mk. vii. 29 ἐξελήλυθεν τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκ τῆς θυγατρός σου: Lk. viii. 33 ἐξελθόντα δὲ τὰ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 35 ἀφ' οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν.

39. Tischendorf, describing the reading of *A* here, says *ex emendatione primae manus qua verbis* πνεῦμα κυρίου ἥρπασεν τὸν Φίλιππον *erasis suprascripsit* πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐνοῦχον. The words πνεῦμα . . . Φίλιππον, as may be seen from the facsimile of *A*, occupy an extra line at the foot of the page. This important reading shows that the writer of *A* had access to a *Z* text. For similar evidence regarding *C* cf. ch. xiv. 19.

The variant in 𝔖ph, κυρίου for ἅγιον (after πνεῦμα), is very attractive, since it supplies a reason for the omission in Γ, *cett.*, i.e. that a writer passed from the first κυρίου to the second (ὁμ.).

CHAPTER IX

IX. 4–5. In this passage the words σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν are placed either after the first διώκεις (*v.* 4), or after the second διώκεις (*v.* 5) by the authorities which contain them, while they are omitted by Γ, *cett.* (*def. D*). In xxii. 7, where the attestation is somewhat weaker, they come after the first διώκεις (*om.* Γ, *cett.* (*D*)). In xxvi. 14, where they occur in all authorities (*def. D*), they occur after the first διώκεις.

The usual view is that ix. 4 (5) and xxii. 7 have been interpolated from xxvi. 14. I find it difficult to believe that the writer of Acts would reserve this picturesque detail for the third occasion on which the story is told. Could he have been, to say the least, so inartistic? We should have expected the three accounts to agree, or, failing this, that, if a striking detail was dropped, it would be in xxii. 7 or xxvi. 14.

It seems more probable that the confusion has arisen from the fact that the word διώκεις occurs twice. A στίχος containing σκληρόν . . . λακτίζειν may have dropped out and subsequently been reinserted in the wrong place. This supposition would account both for the difference in the collocation of the words and for their omission by Γ, *cett.*

There can be little doubt that the words in question suit the sense better in *v.* 4 here (cf. xxvi. 14) than in *v.* 5. There is, however, a possibility which must not be wholly dismissed, viz. that there may have been an original discrepancy between the collocation of σκληρόν . . . λακτίζειν in ix. 4–(5) and xxvi. 14. This would be easier to believe than that the words could be wholly omitted here.

It will be understood that I do not speak with the same confidence about xxii. 7. It is equally simple to suppose that the words were omitted there from ix. 4 (5), or inserted from xxvi. 14. Where they are really required is in ix. 4 (5).

11–12. My views upon this passage have been already set forth on p. liii, and need not be repeated here. Corssen expresses himself strongly upon the reading of the MSS. saying, 'No one has raised any objection to *v.* 12' (καὶ εἶδεν . . . ἀναβλέψῃ) 'though the absurdity of the verse in this connexion must strike the eye of every unprejudiced reader. Paul sees a man, whom he has never seen before, and sees that the man is named Ananias, he sees in the man his name. Can anything be more obviously nonsensical?' He does not, however, omit the verse with 𝔏h, as was afterwards done by Blass, but contents

himself with the deletion of ἐν ὁράματι and Ἀνανίαν ὀνόματι, i.e. he reads καὶ εἶδεν ἄνδρα εἰσελθόντα (*med. om.*) καὶ ἐπιθέντα κ.τ.λ., a reading which seems somewhat bold.

CHAPTER X

X. 25. The longer version of this passage, as given by *D* and *c.Th.*, has already been quoted (p. xxiii) as an example of vivid narration, in place of which Γ, *cett.* have a tame abbreviation. While *c.Th.* agrees completely with *D*, the agreement of 𝔏^g is incomplete. For purposes of comparison I arrange its reading in στίχοι corresponding to those found in *D*, viz.:

cum appropinquasset autem Petrus
unus ex servis procurrens
nuntiavit eum venisse
tunc obviavit ei Cornelius.

Here 𝔏^g omits εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν (στ.) after l. 1, and ὁ δὲ Κορνήλιος ἐκπηδήσας (στ.) after l. 3, but otherwise agrees with *D, c.Th.* It then goes on with Γ, *cett.* (*sim.*). 𝔏^p on the other hand agrees with Γ, *cett.* throughout, except that it adds εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν from *Z* (so also *vg.*^qw).

It is a common, I might say normal, experience to find that when the chief representatives of the *Z* text, i.e. *D, c.Th.*, 𝔏^h, have a longer reading, not found in Γ, *disiecta membra* of it occur in the minor representatives of *Z*. It is a curious and suggestive fact that where *D* is extant these *disiecta membra* generally form separate στίχοι in *D*. Cf. xi. 2; xiii. 29; xiv. 20; xv. 2, 23, 34; xvi. 35, 39; xxiii. 15; xxiv. 6–8, 25–7; xxv. 24–5; xxvii. 1, &c.

36–8. The chief difficulty of this passage (cf. p. lii) lies in the construction of *vv.* 37–8. As given by *D*, we have ἀρξάμενος γὰρ . . . Ἰησοῦν . . . ὃν ἔχρισεν ὁ Θεός . . . οὗτος διῆλθεν. Why is Ἰησοῦν substituted for Ἰησοῦς? The reading of Γ, *cett.* offers similar difficulties, viz. (οἴδατε τὸ γενόμενον ῥῆμα καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας) ἀρξάμενος (without γὰρ) . . . Ἰησοῦν . . . ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός . . . ὃς διῆλθεν.

Blass's treatment of these verses seems strange. He brackets κύριος in *v.* 36 with the note '*spurium* κύριος', but gives no reason for this remark or explanation of the words οὗτός ἐστιν πάντων. He also says of ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας '*videntur haec spuria, v. Luc.* xxiii. 5'. The passage to which he refers is διδάσκων καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας. To this may be added Acts i. 21–2 εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος Ἰωάννου. Both passages serve to illustrate the meaning of the present passage, but the hypothesis of interpolation from Lk. xxiii. 5 seems very improbable.

If the transposition which I have made is accepted, the construction becomes simple and regular. Ἰησοῦν is in the accusative after τὸ γενόμενον (or τὸ γεν. ῥῆμα) and ἀρξάμενος is followed by οὗτος. I do not attach much importance to minor variants here. I have adopted ῥῆμα from Γ, *cett.* in view of Lk. ii. 15 ἴδωμεν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο τὸ γεγονός, Acts v. 32 ἡμεῖς μάρτυρες τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων, where ῥῆμα = 'thing'. The addition of the word, however, makes the line unusually long (44 letters). I am now disposed to think that I should have done better to read ὃν ἔχρισεν in *v.* 37 with *D*, 𝔏^gpt, 𝔖.

46. If *praevaricatis* represents ἑτέραις in *D*, before a corrector erased not only this word, but nearly all the στίχος in which it stood, the translator must have had in his mind the Pauline view of γλῶσσαι. Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 21 ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται ὅτι ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χείλεσιν ἑτέρων λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ; a reference to Isaiah xxviii. 11 διὰ φαυλισμὸν χειλέων, διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας ὅτι λαλήσουσι τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ. It must be remembered that in xix. 6 *c. Th.*, 𝔏ᵖ, *vg.*ᵃ, *Ephr.* have a passage (*om. D. cett.*) referring to the ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν discussed in 1 Cor. xiv. In ch. 2, *v.* 4 𝔏ᵈ renders ἑτέραις γλώσσαις by *aliis linguis*, and it is somewhat difficult to see why a different rendering should be adopted here. It does not seem likely that so ignorant a person could have hit on this learned translation. Mill conjectured ποικίλαις (Hilgenfeld supposed that *praevaricatis* was a corruption for *variegatis*), but no reference is given for ποικίλαι γλῶσσαι. *Praevaricari* (+acc.) is generally used to render παραβαίνειν (= transgress): cf. 1. 25 where for παρέβη 𝔏ᵉᵍ, *vg.* have *praevaricatus est* (*transgressus est* 𝔏ᵈᵖ). It is possible that *D* here had not ἑτέραις, but a stronger word which shocked the reader who deleted most of the line, e.g. διεστραμμέναις. This, of course, is only offered as a suggestion: there may have been some other word which would naturally be rendered by *praevaricatis*.

CHAPTER XI

XI. 2. This is a very important and instructive passage. After τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ at the end of *v.* 1 *D*, supported (*ex parte*) by 𝔏ᵖ, *vg.*ᑫʷ, 𝔖ᵖʰ, has seven στίχοι which do not appear in Γ, *cett.* The first three στίχοι (ὁ μὲν οὖν . . . τοὺς ἀδελφούς) are identical in the authorities which contain them. In στ. 4 *D* omits ἐξῆλθεν, which is given by the other witnesses and is necessary to the sense. In στ. 6 𝔏ᵖ, *vg.*ᑫʷ, 𝔖ᵖʰ end after διδάσκων αὐτούς. *D* then goes on alone with ὃς καί . . . τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ. It is to be observed that *D* alone furnishes us with a simple explanation of the omission by Γ, *cett.*, viz. that the eye of a copyist passed from τοῦ Θεοῦ at the end of *v.* 1 to τοῦ Θεοῦ later on (cf. p. xxiv).

A similar case is to be found in xiii. 43 where *D* has:

επειθον αυτους προσμενειν τη χαριτι του θ̅υ̅
εγενετο δε καθ ολης της πολεως
διελθειν τον λογον του θ̅υ̅.

c.Th. E, *vg.*ᑫʷ agree with *D*, except that they omit τοῦ Θεοῦ in στ. 3; Γ, *cett.* omit στ. 2 and 3, i.e. they pass from θ̅υ̅ in στ. 1 to θ̅υ̅ in στ. 3.

In the present passage the arrangement of στίχοι 4–6 in *D* is somewhat odd. We should expect πολὺν λόγον ποιούμενος διὰ τῶν χωρῶν to form a στίχος and διδάσκων αὐτούς to form another. Possibly πολὺν λόγον has got out of place after the omission of ἐξῆλθεν.

After την χαριν του θ̅υ̅ *D* goes on with

οι δε εκ περιτομης αδελφοι διεκρινοντο.

Γ, *cett.* have ὅτε δὲ ἀνέβη Πέτρος εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα οἱ ἐκ περιτ. κ.τ.λ. The extra words ὅτε δὲ . . . Ἱερ. are indispensable to the sense. Peter first made a tour through the villages, and then went to Jerusalem, where he made his speech to the ἀδελφοὶ ἐκ περιτομῆς. It is clear that *D* has here dropped a στίχος and

botched by the insertion of δέ after οἱ in the next line (cf. p. xxxiv). Similar cases of consequential botching in *D* occur xix. 21 ; xx. 26; xxi. 5.

27–28. The two στίχοι here preserved by *D*, 𝔏ᵖ, *vg.*ᵍʷ. (*om.* Γ, *cett.*), are of great interest on account of ἡμῶν in στ. 2. According to Γ, *cett.* the first use of the first person plur. (a very doubtful one) occurs in xiv. 22 : clear cases do not occur until xvi. 10. Ropes is of opinion that the 'Bezan reviser' was aware of the tradition connecting the author of the book with Antioch and therefore inserted these lines here. This seems to me curiously perverse. If we examine the accounts of Luke in Eusebius and Jerome, who presumably knew all that was to be known on the subject, we find that all their information, with the possible exception of their statement that he came from Antioch, is drawn from references in the N.T. The natural conclusion, therefore, is that the tradition connecting Luke with Antioch was founded on the *Z* reading here. Such a tradition might easily survive after the evidence for it had been removed by the abbreviator.

It is allowed by all that the style of the Acts changes in the course of the work. We suddenly find ourselves in the presence of a writer who is drawing upon his own observations or upon information supplied to himself. Where is it that the style begins to change? I can only speak for myself, but I should say, certainly not at xvi. 10, or even xiv. 22. My impression is that the change takes place at xi. 19–20 where we are told that after the death of Stephen scattered disciples went to Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, who only taught the Jews. Then some of them who came from Cyprus and Cyrene went to Antioch and there taught the Greeks also.

In xiii. 1 we have a list of prophets and teachers in the Church at Antioch. Among them figures Λούκιος Κυρηναῖος, apparently one of the Κυρηναῖοι mentioned in xi. 20. Some interesting questions which arise in connexion with him will be discussed later on : this will be in the Appendix.

CHAPTER XII

XII. 10. The detail that Peter and the angel when coming out of prison 'walked down the seven steps' (the article implies that the number of steps was well known in Jerusalem), though only found in *D* and *ex parte* in 𝔏ᵖ (the omission of *septem* by 𝔏ᵖ is due to misunderstanding of the Greek numeral ·ζ·, here used in *D*), has greatly impressed the keenest defenders of the ordinary text. It is easy to see how the words could have dropped out, but it is impossible to see how they could have been invented by a reviser, however imaginative. We may compare such famous variants as xix. 9 ἀπὸ ὥρας πέμπτης ἕως δεκάτης, xx. 15 καὶ μείναντες ἐν Τρωγυλίᾳ, xxvii. 5 δι' ἡμερῶν δεκαπέντε, which are sufficiently defended by the minuteness of the details which they give. Ropes here admits that the reading of *D*, 𝔏ᵖ, 'seems to imply local knowledge not to be drawn from the B-text'. Rendel Harris said long ago, 'I must confess that there are few things that have so deceived me in the Western text as this gloss about the seven steps of the prison at Jerusalem has done. Its innocent touch of originality had almost led me to join Bornemann in his worship of the Western idol.' At that time unfortunately he adopted a hostile view of *D* and rejected the reading by which he had formerly been fascinated.

The picturesque detail about the seven steps is thoroughly in keeping with the context. The story of Peter's escape and arrival at the house of Mary, 'the mother of John, who was called Mark', is told with great vividness and dramatic power which reminds us of the 'we-sections' where the author is speaking in the first person. As, however, he was at Antioch at the time (xi. 28), he must have got his facts from a very well-informed friend. Blass remarks briefly on Μάρκου in *v.* 12 *quasi digito monstratur auctor narrationis.* In *v.* 25 Barnabas and Saul, when returning from Jerusalem to Antioch, take with them John Mark, in whose mother's house Peter had taken refuge. In Antioch he must have met the writer of Acts. The identification proposed by Blass seems certain. John Mark would have known all about the seven steps leading up to the prison.

19–23. Josephus tells us, *Ant.* xviii. 6–7 (§§ 195–200), that Herod, while a prisoner in Rome under Tiberius, was told by a German soldier that he would be restored to his former position after he had seen an owl, but that when he saw the owl a second time, it would be an omen of approaching death. After his vainglorious speech on this occasion he looking up saw the owl sitting on a rope above his head and knew that he was lost: he was seized by internal pains (*διακάρδιος ὀδύνη*) and died five days later, *τῷ τῆς γαστρὸς ἀλγήματι διεργασθείς*. He says nothing about the Tyrians and Sidonians, or of Herod's being eaten by worms. It seems likely that the circumstantial details about the Tyrians and Blastus, Herod's chamberlain, in *v.* 20 are perfectly authentic, though Josephus did not trouble to record the story. For the account of Herod's death given in Acts, cf. 2 Macc. ix. 9 where it is said of Antiochus Epiphanes *ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς σκώληκας ἀναζεῖν καὶ ζῶντος ἐν ὀδύναις καὶ ἀλγηδόσι τὰς σάρκας αὐτοῦ διαπίπτειν, ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς ὀσμῆς αὐτοῦ πᾶν τὸ στρατόπεδον βαρύνεσθαι τῇ σαπρίᾳ*. The silence of Josephus, who, when describing the death of Antiochus, *Ant.* xii. 9. 1 (§ 357), gives no hint that it was in any way abnormal, probably shows that he discredited the story. A similar death is attributed to Maximinus the Second by Eus. (*H. E.* viii. 16. 4) and other authorities, also to Hunneric, son of Genseric, by Victor Vitensis, iii. 71, but the genuineness of this passage is disputed. Both were notorious persecutors.

It is interesting to notice that in one respect the reading of *D* (*v.* 23) is reconcilable with the account of Josephus, viz. *καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος . . . ἔτι ζῶν*, while that of Γ, *cett.*, which implies that Herod died on the spot, is not. The statement in *D* that Herod came down from his tribunal occurs in Ephrem's list of contents (*mortuus est de vermibus cum degrederetur de bemate suo*), also in his commentary.

It is to be noticed that in *v.* 22 *D* has a superfluous δέ, taken from Γ, *cett.*, before *δῆμος* in *στ.* 2. In 𝔏p *στ.* 1 (*καταλλαγέντος . . . Τυρίοις*) was omitted by the first hand: the second hand adds *regratiato eo Tyriis et Sidoniis* (cf. *v.* 20). The first hand renders *στ.* 2 by *cumque re conclamasset* (= $\overset{re}{\textit{con}}$-) *ei populus adclamant ei.* Here there is a conflation of renderings (without δέ).

25. For this passage cf. p. l. Ropes says that 'the exegetical difficulty of the best attested reading (*εις ιερουσαλημ*) is not insuperable, for *εις ιερουσαλημ* may have been intended to mean "at Jerusalem"; at any rate this reading was

adopted in carefully written MSS. for many centuries'. This proves nothing except that the 'careful writers' did not consult their reason. Cf. xxv. 13 (p. lii).

CHAPTER XIII

XIII. 1. A ninth-century MS. (*Anon.*[c]), which contains a collection of prophecies, quotes the words Λούκιος Κυρηναῖος, Μαναήν τε Ἡρώδου τοῦ τετράρχου σύντροφος in the following form:

Lucius Cyrinensis qui manet usque adhuc et Ticius conlactaneus.

It is obvious at the first glance that this quotation is corrupt and that *manet* is a very gross blunder for *manaen*. The other errors need not detain us here.

Zahn here keeps *qui manet usque adhuc* (i.e. 'who is still alive') and after Titus (= Ticius) inserts *Antiochensis*, *Manaenque Herodis tetrarchae*. He recognizes in *Anon.*[c] a representative of what he calls *lt*[1] (i.e. the oldest Latin translation) and thinks that the variant *qui manet usque adhuc* comes from the first edition of Acts, written while Lucius was alive, and was removed after his death from a second edition. In the same way in xxi. 9 where *Anon.*[c] credits Philip with five daughters instead of four, Zahn suggests that the writer at first miscounted them and subsequently finding that he had made an error corrected it in time for the second edition.

There is not a tittle of evidence for connecting this tract with Africa or for supposing that it was composed early in the fourth century. Zahn has attempted *arcem facere ex cloaca* (Cic. *Planc.* 95).

6–8. The reading of Γ, *cett.* in *v.* 6 is Βαριησοῦς (Barjesus), and in *v.* 8 Ἐλύμας ὁ μάγος, οὕτως γὰρ μεθερμηνεύεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. In all other passages in the N.T. where this formula occurs, an Aramaic word is translated into Greek. The natural meaning therefore here is that Elymas is the Greek equivalent for Barjesus (Aramaic). This is absurd, since Barjesus needs no explanation and can only mean 'Son of Jesus'.

Jerome recognized that Barjesus was corrupt. In his *Nomina Hebraica* he says:

Berieu maleficum, sive a malo. Nonnulli *Bariesu* corrupte legunt.

Jerome is here thinking of 1 Chron. vii. 23 'He called his name Beriah, because it was evil with his house' (cf. viii. 13, 16, 21). The name also occurs in Gen. xlvi. 17. It is formed from the Hebrew *bĕ-raʿ* or *bĕ-rāʿāh* = 'in evil' or 'by evil'. (Driver.)

Jerome explains Elimas (*sic*) as = *ad transgressionem sive transgredi faciens*. Lagarde quotes a gloss, *Elymas*: ἀφιστῶν, but this is probably founded on Jerome. Mr. Driver tells me that *'ĕlî* ('unto') and *mâ'ôs* might signify 'unto rejection', especially of God. This seems more probable than an old theory, criticized by Scaliger, that Elymas is derived from the Arabic *ʿalîm* (= wise, so *ʿUlemâ* = wise men) and that this Arabic word is interpreted as μάγος.[1]

There is a fatal objection to Jerome's explanation of *Elymas*, viz. that a Greek word is required. How can the sorcerer be called by one Semitic name (*Berieu*) in *v.* 6 and by another (*Elymas*) in *v.* 8, without any warning that

[1] *Scaligerana* (1698), p. 134.

both Semitic names refer to the same person? Klostermann makes merry over the attempt to explain a Jewish name from an Arabic root.[1]

I now turn to other authorities which have a different reading in place of Bar-Jesus.

It is convenient to begin with Syriac versions, since the authors of these were in all probability better able to deal with Semitic names than was the case with Greek scribes. It is therefore interesting to find that Ephrem gives *Barshoma* and the Peshitto has *Barshuma*. This word used to be explained as meaning 'Son of the name' (Syr. *šĕmâ*), but recent scholars[2] derive it from the Syriac *šûmtâ* = 'stripe', 'weal', or 'wound'.

Barshûmâ is a Syriac name, which occurs in an inscription from Edessa published by E. Sacher.[3] In this a woman describes herself as 'daughter of *Barshûmâ*', and on the side of the stone there is a mutilated inscription, 'The children of *Barshûmâ*, the son of . . .' Sacher says that 'the name *Barshûmâ* is known from Acts xiii. 6'. He does not seem to have been aware that two well-known persons of this name flourished in cent. v A.D. One of these, a Syrian archimandrite, was a prominent and violent member of the Monophysite party, who was present at the *latrocinium* (ληστικὴ σύνοδος) of Ephesus in 449, where he took part in a murderous attack upon Flavianus, Patriarch of Constantinople.[4] He was also present at the Council of Chalcedon in 451, where he spoke through an interpreter.[5] Another well-known Barsumas at this time was a Nestorian who, after being banished from Edessa by Rabbula, became Bishop of Nisibis from 435 to 489.

I now call attention to a more interesting, though sinister, personage, who seems to have escaped the notice of commentators. This is a man whom Procopius[6] describes as Πέτρον ὀνόματι, Σύρον γένος, ὅνπερ ἐπίκλησιν Βαρσύμην ἐκάλουν. He was a μάγος of whom we are told περὶ τοὺς φαρμακέας καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια παρέργως ἐσπούδακε ὁ Βαρσύμης οὗτος. He became a great favourite of the Empress Theodora (*d.* 548) who was herself addicted to magic (μάγοις τε γὰρ καὶ φαρμακεῦσι καὶ αὐτὴ ὁμιλήσασα ἐκ παιδός).

It is very singular that there should be a Syrian μάγος at the court of Theodora in cent. vi, whose name is identical with that employed by Syriac translators in the present passage of Acts. I leave others to judge whether this is a pure coincidence or whether the name Βαρσύμης was affected by Syrian occultists.

I now come to the readings of *D* and its allies.

In *v.* 6 *D* has Βαριησουα||. Scrivener says that the erased letter was ν or μ.

[1] *Probleme in Aposteltexte* (1883), p. 23.

[2] Klostermann l.c., p. 23: Burkitt, *J.T.S.* iv (1902–3), p. 127 f. (Driver agrees and would render 'Scar-face'.)

[3] *Zeitschr. d. deutsch. Morgenländ. Gesell.*, vol. xxxvi (1882), p. 164.

[4] Mansi vii. 68 Βαρσουμᾶς . . . ἔσφαξε τὸν μακάριον Φλαυιανόν. αὐτὸς ἔστηκε καὶ ἔλεγε· σφάξον . . . πᾶσαν Συρίαν Βαρσουμᾶς ἠφάνισεν, ἐπήγαγεν ἡμῖν χιλίους μονάζοντας . . . οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐβόησαν· τὸν φονέα Βαρσουμᾶν ἔξω βάλετε· τὸν φονέα τῷ σταδίῳ· ἀναθέμα τῷ Βαρσουμᾷ· Βαρσουμᾶν τῇ ἐξορίᾳ.

[5] Mansi vi. 862 Βαρσουμᾶς . . . δι' ἑρμηνέως Εὐσεβίου μοναχοῦ εἶπε. Cf. p. 927.

[6] *Anecdota* xxii. 3 f.

Wetstein (as I observed after the App. Crit. to this volume was printed off) had previously remarked '*Βαριησουαμ D a prima manu*'. 𝔏[d] has *Bariesuam*, and Lucifer gives *Bariesubam* (cf. p. 212). These readings are supported by a tract published among spurious works attributed to Chrysostom,[1] which has :

> 'Venerunt enim Dositheus et Simon et Cleonius et Varisuas in nomine Christi et alii multi quos Apostolus in epistulis suis tangit.'

In the *Acta Barnabae* the forms Βαρισσοῦς, -ισοῦς, -ιησσοῦς are found.

In *v.* 8 in place of Ἐλύμας *D* has Ετ||ιμας. That the erased letter was -ο- cannot be doubted in view of *Etoemas* in 𝔏[d] and Lucifer. (For the reading of 𝔏[g] cf. p. 212.) In Ambrosiaster the MSS. vary between *ethimas*, *etymas*, *tymas*, *thimas*, while one MS. (*C*), cent. ix, has the curious reading *atrmas*. In a passage of Pacianus, where Migne (xiii, p. 1061) gives *Helima*, MSS. used by Reifferscheid have *hetymam* or *hetym mam*.

I now come to a very ingenious suggestion made by Rendel Harris in a communication to the *Expositor* (1902, pp. 189–95) under the title, 'A curious Bezan reading justified'. The facts are as follows :

In Josephus *Ant.* xx. 7. 2 (§ 142) it has been usual to read :

> καὶ Σίμωνα ὀνόματι τῶν ἑαυτοῦ φίλων, Ἰουδαῖον, Κύπριον δὲ τὸ γένος, μάγον εἶναι σκηπτόμενον πέμπει πρὸς αὐτήν.

Felix, who wished to seduce Drusilla, wife of Azizus, employed this person to act as go-between.

Here the Ambrosian MS. (cent. xi), supported by the Epitome, gives Ἄτομον in place of Σίμωνα, and is followed by Niese. It cannot be doubted that Σίμωνα is an interpolation drawn from Acts viii. 9–24, where Simon Magus, who is not said to have come from Cyprus, is mentioned as practising magic in Samaria. No one could have altered Σίμωνα to Ἄτομον, an otherwise unknown person. Rendel Harris proceeds to identify *Atomus* with *Etoemas* (*sim.*). Both were Jews, magicians, and of Cypriotic origin: both were on intimate terms with Roman governors. In connexion with this suggestion I venture to call attention to the curious variant (*atrmas*) which is found in an old MS. of Ambrosiaster (cf. *supra*).

The problem which we have to consider is whether Ἑτοιμᾶς (*paratus*) or Ἄτομος ('atom' or 'uncut') can be regarded as a Greek rendering of Βαριησουαμ (-αν) or Barshûma. The etymology need not be a good one. Burkitt points out that many of those given in Evv. are unscientific. The same remark holds good of derivations proposed by classical writers.

Klostermann (p. 31) endeavours to connect Βαριησουαμ with the Hebrew root *shava* 'be equal' or *yesh* 'to be', and says that it means 'son of readiness (or dexterity)', and that ἕτοιμος is the nearest Greek equivalent. He says that 'in intercourse with Jews he was called *Barjesuan*: in intercourse with Greeks he was called Hetömus' (p. 32). As I found his remarks somewhat obscure, I thought it best to submit a statement of the facts to Mr. Driver, who has given his opinion in the note which follows.

[1] *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* (Migne lvi, p. 901).

'At first sight Βαριήσουα looks as if it represents *Bar-yešûaʿ* (בר־ישוע), especially as Aquila transcribes *Yĕhôšûaʿ* (the old form of *Yēšûaʿ*) by Ιησουα;[1] and this indeed, combined with the fact that *Bar-yešûᶜ* (ܒܪ ܝܫܘܥ) is a name attested in Syriac sources,[2] explains why Βαρϊησοῦς appears in some MSS. This suggestion, however, will not fit the facts; for *Yēšûaʿ* means "Yah(weh) saves", while Βαριησουα is explained in the passage under discussion as Ἑτοιμᾶς, which must mean "ready" or "prepared" or the like. Some other name, therefore, which fulfils this condition must be sought, and the only possibility seems to be *Yišwî* (יִשְׁוִי) or *Yišwāh* (יִשְׁוָה), two names found in the genealogy of the tribe of Asher;[3] for the root to which these names are usually referred is the Hebrew *šāwāh* (שָׁוָה) "was like", the Aram. *šĕwāʾ* (שְׁוָא) and the Syriac *šwâ* (ܫܘܐ) "was like", "equal", "worth" or "worthy".[4] This derivation indeed yields the required sense, since one who is *par* to a task is obviously *paratus*,[5] with which ἑτοῖμος exactly corresponds. The Greek transcriptions of these two names in the LXX are various: *e.g.* of *Yišwî* there occur Ιεσσουα (LXX^h) in Genesis, Ιεσου (LXX^B) in Numbers, Ιεσουι (LXX^A) and Ισουι (LXX^B) in Chronicles; and of *Yišwāh* there occur Ιεσσαι (LXX^A) and Ιεσσουα (LXX^{i*s}) and Ιεσουα (LXX^{DM}) in Genesis, Ιεσουα (LXX^A) and Ισουα (LXX^B) in Chronicles. Further, the Bohairic version has *Iesua* (Boh.^{lp}) for *Yišwî* in Genesis. None of these forms is far from the Ιησουα of Acts, and two points alone call for comment: first, the η in place of the expected ε; second, the ending -α(ν) or -α(μ). Both can be easily explained. First, the name *Yišwî* or *Yišwāh* is so rare that there is no reason to expect any of the transcriptions of the LXX to be well enough known to be exactly reproduced in the New Testament, and indeed not only ιε- but also ιη- sometimes represent the Hebrew verbal prefix *yi-* in Greek transcriptions: *e.g.* both Ἰερεμίας and Ἰηρεμίας stand for *Yirmĕyāh* (= "Jeremiah") in the LXX,[6] although only Ἰερεμίας appears in the New Testament. Secondly, the form of the sentence εὗρον ἄνδρα τινὰ μάγον ψευδοπροφήτην Ἰουδαῖον καλούμενον Βαριησοῦα(ν) shows that the name stands in the accusative case, and this suggests that -α(ν) is simply the Greek termination of that case

[1] Deut. i. 38.

[2] Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, II. 422 (cited *sub voce* by Payne Smith).

[3] Gen. xlvi. 17 = 1 Chron. vii. 30; cf. Numb. xxvi. 44. It is possible, and even probable, that *Yišwî* and *Yišwāh* are doublets; for, while both occur in Genesis and Chronicles, only *Yišwî* is found in Numbers (where, moreover, the Samaritan and Syriac versions have *Yišwāh*, which also suggests that the two names are really identical). This uncertainty, however, does not affect the present argument.

[4] Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Hebrew Lexicon*, 1000–1001. Noth (*Israelitische Personennamen*, 227–228) suggests that *Yišwî* means 'maimed in the left hand', referring it to an entirely different (Arabic) root; but, whatever the correct derivation of the name may be, there can be no doubt that a Jewish scholar would not hesitate to explain it as above.

[5] Cf. Brockelmann (*Lexicon Syriacum*², 760), where *par fuit* is the primary meaning assigned to the Syriac verb.

[6] Cf. 1 Sam. xiv. 49, where *Yišwî* is given as the name of one of Saul's sons in the Hebrew text (which is here almost certainly wrong) and it (or whatever the original name may have been) is transcribed Ιησουε in the LXX (cf. Josephus, *Ant. Jud.*, VI. vi. 6).

(since Hebrew names are freely furnished with Greek case-endings in the New Testament); and, if this surmise is correct, it may be suggested that the alternative -α(μ) in Βαριησοῦα(μ) is the Latin termination of the same case, introduced under the reflex influence of the Latin *Bariesuam* by a scribe who did not understand the nature of the ending.'

19-21. In these verses there are two interesting points of chronology, viz.:
(1) The period of 450 years referred to in *v.* 20.
(2) The length of Saul's reign, which is put at 40 years in *v.* 21.

According to the reading of *D*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖^{vg} the 450 years cover the period of the Judges, from the death of Joshua to Samuel, i.e. to the death of Eli. This does not agree with a very important date in O.T. chronology, viz. 1 Kings vi. 1, where we are told that Solomon began to build the temple in the fourth year of his reign, 480 years after the Exodus. It is obvious that if the period of Judges lasted for 450 years a much larger number of years is required to cover the events of the whole period.

The reading of Γ, *cett.* is rendered thus in the Revised Version: 'He gave *them* their land for an inheritance, for about 450 years, and after these things he gave *them* judges until Samuel the prophet.' Two interpretations have been placed upon this, viz. (*a*) that 450 years passed between the division of the land by Joshua and the institution of Judges, (*b*) that the conquest of the land took 450 years. Both of these are wholly irreconcilable with all systems of Jewish chronology.

I now come to the evidence of Josephus. This is given in its simplest form in the κεφάλαιον (summary) to *Ant.* v, viz. 'From the death of Moses to the death of Eli 476 years'. This period includes the rule of Joshua, which Josephus (v. 1. 29) sets at 25 years, whereas the 450 years in Acts, according to *D*, are subsequent to the work of Joshua. If we subtract 25 from 476 the result is 451. The agreement between *D* and Josephus is complete.

It has already been noticed that in 1 Kings vi. 1 the period from Exodus to the foundation of the temple is put at 480 years. Josephus, however, puts it at 592 years (*Ant.* viii. 3. 1), a difference of 112 years. His figure is made up thus according to the κεφάλαια:

Bks. III and IV.	From Exodus to death of Moses . .	40 years.
V.	From death of Moses to death of Eli .	476 ,,
VI.	From death of Eli to death of Saul .	32 ,,
VII.	From death of Saul to death of David .	40 ,,
	Add 4 years of Solomon's reign . . .	4
		592

Josephus gives other calculations which show that he had a consistent system of chronology, apart from certain cases where his text has been interpolated. Before mentioning them, however, it is necessary to consider the chronology of Saul. The chief passages are:

Ant. x.	8. 4.	Saul reigned 20 years.
vi.	13. 5.	Samuel ruled alone for 12 years and 18 years with Saul.
	14. 9.	Saul reigned 18 years while Samuel was alive and 2 after his death.

In the last passage 2 is given by the Epitome, Zonaras, and the Latin version. The MSS. of Josephus give 22, a number which is contradicted by the κεφάλαιον to Bk. VI quoted above, which makes the period of Samuel and Saul cover 32 years (Samuel 12, Samuel + Saul 18, Saul alone 2 = 32). This is a clear case of interpolation intended to harmonize Josephus with Acts.

The period of two years assigned by Josephus to Saul as sole ruler after the death of Samuel seems insufficient for the various events recorded in 1 Sam. xxv–xxxi. 4. Strack and Billerbeck, quoting Seder Olam, say that, according to the official chronology of the Old Synagogue, Saul reigned for three years together with Samuel and for four months after Samuel's death. The numerals here given must be corrupt. The data for the career of Saul are notoriously unsatisfactory. We do not even know his age when he came to the throne. In 1 Sam. xiii. 1 the Hebrew has the absurd reading 'Saul was a year old when he began to reign', where it is obvious that a numeral has dropped out. The Septuagint omits the verse, which is added in some late MSS. with the date 30 years of age. This, however, can hardly be correct, since in *v.* 2 Jonathan is already in command of a division.

Since Solomon, as well as David, is said to have reigned for 40 years, popular tradition may have assigned 40 years' rule to Saul also. In the present passage the number 40 occurs in *v.* 18 (of the wandering in the desert), then in *v.* 20 comes 450 (period of Judges), and in *v.* 21 40 recurs (of Saul). Every reader would know that two other periods of 40 (for David and Solomon) were to follow.

Other statements of Josephus are:

Ant. xx. 10. 1. The period from Exodus to the foundation of the Temple was 612 years. This is in direct contradiction with viii. 3. 1, where it is put at 592, a figure supported by the κεφάλαια.

As 612–592 = 20, it is clear that Josephus has been interpolated. Cf. vi. 14. 9.

Ant. xi. 4. 8. The period of Kings from Saul to the Captivity lasted for 532 years.

Ant. x. 8. 2–5. The Temple was burnt 470 years after its foundation and 1,062 after the Exodus.

These passages may be taken together. If we subtract 532 (the Regal period) from 1,062 the result is 530 for the previous period from Exodus to Saul. In viii. 3. 1 we were told that the period from Exodus to the foundation of the Temple consisted of 592 years. In order to compare the two statements we must deduct 64 years from 592, viz. 20 (Saul), 40 (David), 4 (Solomon). The result is 528 as compared with 530 in x. 8. 4.

There remains one passage which is somewhat obscure. This is in xi. 4. 8 where, after saying that the Regal period lasted for 532 years, Josephus goes on to state that previously the people were ruled by κριταὶ καὶ μόναρχοι for more than 500 years μετὰ Μωυσῆν ἀποθανόντα καὶ Ἰησοῦν τὸν στρατηγόν. It is not clear whether this refers to the death of Moses, or to that of Joshua 25 years later. In any case it does not agree with the statement of Josephus that the period

from the death of Joshua to the death of Eli consisted of 450 years. In all probability there is some corruption in the text here.

The commentary of Bede upon these verses contained in his *Expositio* of the Acts and in his later *Retractatio* shows the perplexity to which he was reduced. In the *Expositio* he says that the 450 years referred to the period from the promise to Abraham to the division of the land among the people (405 from the promise to Exodus + 40 in wilderness + 5 for conquest). In his *Retractatio* he notes that his Greek MS. gave καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὡς ἔτεσι τετρ. καὶ πεντ. ἔδωκεν κριτάς κ.τ.λ. (= *E* δ), of which he says *quod quomodo conveniat sententiae quae in libro Regum continetur . . . non est nostrae facultatis exponere.* In his *Expositio* he says that the length of Saul's reign is not given in the book of Kings, but follows Eusebius who allows 40 years for the rule of Samuel and Saul. In the *Retractatio* he says that after a careful study of Josephus he finds that, according to him, Samuel ruled for 12 years and Saul for 20 (i.e. 18 with Samuel, and 2 after Samuel's death: cf. *Ant.* vi. 13. 5, 14. 9; x. 8. 4).

29. In this interesting passage Γ, *cett.* after γεγραμμένα at the end of στ. 2 go on with καθελόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου ἔθηκαν εἰς μνημεῖον. *D* and *c.Th.* supplement each other. *D* alone gives στ. 3 ᾐτοῦντο . . . μὲν σταυρῶσαι. The use of μέν in στ. 3 indicates the loss of a δέ clause, and Bornemann's supplement (τὸν δὲ Βαραββᾶν ἀπολῦσαι) neatly completes the sense. For the loss of a στίχος in all the MSS., cf. i. 18. *c.Th.* alone contributes σταυρωθέντος . . . καθελεῖν αὐτόν. The next line καὶ ἐπιτυχόντες πάλιν is given by both *D* and *c.Th.* For the distribution of the *disiecta membra* between the authorities, cf. note on xi. 2. Γ, *cett.* omit 4 (5) στίχοι and disguise the omission by omitting καί before καθελόντες.

33. Origen (on Psalm ii) states that he had two Hebrew MSS., in one of which there was no division between Ps. i and ii (ἐν δὲ τῷ ἑτέρῳ συνήπτετο τῷ πρώτῳ). He then refers to the present passage in Acts, which he quotes as ὡς γὰρ γέγραπται ἐν πρώτῳ ψαλμῷ, and says that in Greek MSS. it is numbered as Ps. ii (τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ μέντοι ἀντίγραφα δεύτερον εἶναι τοῦτον μηνύει). He adds that ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ οὐδενὶ τῶν ψαλμῶν ἀριθμὸς παράκειται, πρῶτος εἰ τύχοι ἢ δεύτερος ἢ τρίτος. Hilary says (on Ps. ii) *Paulus, Hebraeus ex Hebraeis, secundum Hebraicam cognitionem et fidem hunc primum esse dixit, translatorum distinctione non usus.* In addition to this direct evidence we find Pss. i and ii combined in Justin (*Apol.* I. 40), Tert. (*Marc.* iv. 22), Cypr. (*Test.* i. 13). Other references are given by Tischendorf and Ropes, to which may be added Aug. *Litt. Petil.* ii. 202, where Petilianus, quoting Ps. ii. 10–13, ascribes the verses to *primus Davidicus psalmus.*

The patristic evidence for πρώτῳ is therefore overwhelming. Also, while it would be very natural for Greek scribes who were familiar with the Septuagint to alter πρώτῳ to δευτέρῳ the reverse process is highly unlikely. Hort makes the curious remark that 'transcriptional probability is in reality favourable or unfavourable to both readings alike'. What he meant by this I cannot tell. Ropes accepts πρώτῳ.

The quotation which follows, *αἴτησαι ... τῆς γῆς* (*D. c.Th.*, *vg.*[a]), is necessary to the sense. The Kingdom of Christ is to be world-wide in fulfilment of the ἐπαγγελία (*v.* 32).

CHAPTER XIV

XIV. 2. The relation of *D* and *c.Th.* to each other is somewhat puzzling. It will be seen that *c.Th.* has no equivalent for τῶν Ἰουδαίων at the end of στ. 1, τῆς συναγωγῆς, which *D* adds after ἄρχοντες in στ. 2, and κατὰ τῶν δικαίων at the end of στ. 3. It is tempting to suppose that *c.Th.* was descended from a MS. written in στίχοι similar to those found in *D*, in which the ends of three consecutive lines were damaged. On the other hand it may be contended that *c.Th.* preserves the original reading of *Z* and that *D* has been interpolated. In στ. 2 τῆς συναγωγῆς (*D*) seems odd after ἀρχισυνάγωγοι in στ. 1, but κατὰ τῶν δικαίων in στ. 3 is strongly defended by Ephrem who has *seniores vero exorti persequebantur iustos.* (The fact that *D* combines two variants, αὐτοῖς and κατὰ τῶν δικαίων, is of minor importance.)

D and *c.Th.* agree in mentioning two sets of officials here, the ἀρχισυνάγωγοι and the ἄρχοντες. A. Büchler in *Jewish Encycl.* i, pp. 86–7 says that 'the archons conducted political affairs, while religious matters were managed by the heads of the synagogue, who at the same time might be archons'. Diehl[1] quotes an inscription from Capua which has *Alfius Iuda arcon arcosynagogus*, and refers to other writers, e.g. Garucci, *Cimitero degli ebrei*, p. 17 *Stafulo arconti et arcisynagogo.*

The last στίχος in the verse (ὁ δὲ ... εἰρήνην), found in *D c.Th.* and various allies, is essential to the sense, since it explains how the Apostles were able to survive the persecution and go on preaching with boldness and success. Without it the sense halts. We are told that a serious persecution was launched, and immediately afterwards that they went on preaching. Ramsay, who pointed out the want of connexion between *v.* 2 (as given by Γ, *cett.*) and *v.* 3, proposed to meet the difficulty by striking out *v.* 3 as a gloss. He said that 'the Bezan text of *vv.* 2, 3, 4 is a good example of its character as a modernized and explanatory edition of an already archaic and obscure text. The discrepancy between *v.* 2 and *v.* 3 called for some remedy, which was found in the supposition that there were two tumults in Iconium. On this supposition *v.* 2 was interpreted of the first tumult, and a conclusion "and the Lord soon gave peace" was tacked on to it. The double tumult lent itself well to the growing Pauline myth which sought to find occasion for the sufferings and persecutions of 2 Cor. xi.'

In *v.* 5 the words καὶ πάλιν ἐπήγειραν διωγμόν occur only in *c.Th.*, but are clearly authentic. In the rest of *v.* 5 and in *v.* 6 down to Δέρβην *c.Th.* differs in small points from Γ, *cett.* (*D*). It seems probable that *D* has been harmonized with Γ. I therefore print the reading of *c.Th.* in στίχοι modelled on those in *D*.

9. The collocation of ὑπάρχων ἐν φόβῳ after λαλοῦντος as found in *D* is clearly superior to that given by 𝔏[h], after περιπεπατήκει: cf. iv. 13. The

[1] *Altchristliche Inschriften*, no. 356.

addition of τοῦ Θεοῦ, though frequent, is not necessary, as may be seen from Diehl, *Vulgärlat. Inschrift.* 365 *religioni Iudeicae metuenti; Ephem. epigr.* iv, p. 291 *Aemilio Valenti Romano metuenti.*

For the curious use of *possidens* in 𝔏[d] to render ὑπάρχων cf. p. 203.

18–19. In these verses a remarkable change takes place in the character of *C*, which breaks away from ℵ*AB* and becomes an important authority for the *Z* text. Curiously enough it is accompanied in this excursion by cod. 81, cent. xi, a British Museum MS. which was highly lauded by Hort on account of its freedom from what he calls 'Syrian' readings. Ropes says of it (p. cclxx) that 'we may well question whether for informing us as to the text of Acts it is not, next to Codex Vaticanus, the most valuable MS. in existence'. It is difficult to see how it can add anything to the authority of *B*, and I only mention it here where it deserts ℵ*AB* and accompanies *C*. The phenomenon to be observed in the case of *C* and 81 is similar to that noticed in viii. 39, where the scribe of *A*, after deleting a Γ reading, substitutes another which is characteristic of *Z*. It is to be noticed that *D* has in some respects, though not in others, been harmonized with Γ, *cett.*

The chief points here are that in *v.* 18 *c.Th.*, *C* (+81) δ, 𝔏[h] have a στίχος (ἀλλά . . . ἴδια) omitted by *cett.* (*D*). In *v.* 19 στ. 1 occurs in *D* as well as in *c.Th. C* (+81) *E*, 𝔏[h]: *om. cett.* (with consequential insertion of δέ after ἐπῆλθον in στ. 2). After στ. 3, *c.Th. C* (+81) *c.Ath.*, 𝔏[h] have a long passage, with some variants, which is omitted by *cett.* (*D*). After this *C* itself (+81) omits a στίχος (καὶ ἐπισείσαντες τοὺς ὄχλους) without support from any other authority. We may compare xi. 2, where *D*, which preserves seven στίχοι omitted by Γ, itself omits a στίχος preserved by Γ, *cett.*

It is to be observed that while *C* agrees with *c.Th.* and 𝔏[h] in these remarkable readings it (+81) differs from them in a small, but significant, particular, viz. the collocation variant ἀπὸ Ἀντιοχείας καὶ Ἰκονίου Ἰουδαῖοι (Γ) as against Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπὸ Ἰκον. καὶ Ἀντιοχ. (*D c.Th.*, 𝔏[h]). This shows that the basis of *C* (+81) here, as elsewhere, belonged to the Γ type, and that the old collocation was retained when the new matter was introduced. This is a familiar phenomenon.

Other noteworthy passages in chs. xiv and xv, where *C* has a *Z* reading omitted by ℵ*AB*, are xiv. 10 σοί . . . Χριστοῦ, xv. 23 περιέχουσαν τάδε, 24 λέγοντες . . . νόμον, 34 ἔδοξεν . . . αὐτοῦ. Three of these (xiv. 10, xv. 23, 34) form a στίχος in *D*. In the remaining case (xv. 24) the words are omitted by *D* as well as by ℵ*AB*, but, as they come at the end of a στ. in *D*, it is probable that *D* has dropped a στίχος.

20. 𝔏[h] here has:

[. . . . . . .] tunc circumdederunt eum dicentes (= disc.) et
[. . . . . . .]ssisset populus uespere leuauit se et intro
[. . . . . .]atem.

In l. 2 *cum discessisset populus* (Blass) produces an excellent sense. Berger took *populus* to be a corruption of *Paulus* (as in *v.* 9 where 𝔏[h] has the same error) and conjectured *cum surrexisset Paulus* (= ἀναστὰς ὁ Παῦλος). For *vespere* 𝔈 has 'when evening had happened'. Ephrem expands this into

'when the day grew late and darkness came on'. Zahn somewhat rashly accepts this expansion and reads κλινούσης τε τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ ἑσπέρας γενομένης.

It is to be noticed that the attestation for καὶ ἀπελθόντος τοῦ ὄχλου and ἑσπέρας γενομένης is very different, the first clause being preserved by 𝔏[h] only, while the second is found in Syriac (Ephrem) and Sahidic as well as in 𝔏[h]. It has already been pointed out (on x. 25) that where *D* is extant, scattered fragments of a passage which is complete in *D*, but omitted by Γ, circulate separately in minor representatives of *Z*. When *D* is not extant, we may with some confidence reverse the process and reconstitute the *disiecta membra* as στίχοι. For this reason I arrange each clause here as a separate στίχος instead of combining them in one.

CHAPTER XV

XV. 1–6. This important passage has already been referred to (p. xlix) as a case where the rival traditions differ fundamentally. In *v.* 2, *D*, supported by various allies, has three στίχοι which do not appear in Γ, *cett.* It may be noticed that, though there is Latin (𝔏[g], *vg.*[qw]) attestation for στ. 1 and 2, στ. 3 is found only in *D*, *c.Th.*, and Ephrem. In στ. 3 we are told that Paul and Barnabas were ordered by persons from Jerusalem who had found fault with their teaching (*v.* 1) to appear before the Apostles at Jerusalem. In *v.* 5 we find that the assailants are back in Jerusalem—whether they travelled by the same ship, or not, is not stated—and renew their attack. This information is contained in the words οἱ δέ . . . πρεσβυτέρους which are peculiar to *D* (2 στ.), *c.Th.*: *om. cett.*

In Γ, *cett.* there is no subject to ἔταξαν, which may refer either to τινες in *v.* 1 or to the rulers of the Church in Antioch. In *v.* 5 we learn that on their arrival Paul and Barnabas were accused by τινες τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων πεπιστευκότες.

So far all is simple. A complication, however, arises from the fact that *D* and *c.Th.* are themselves interpolated from Γ, *cett.*, having incorporated the Γ variant τινες τῶν . . . πεπιστευκότες. This has happened to *c.Th.* in two places. The first is in xv. 1 where after Ἰουδαίας *c.Th.*, supported by δ, adds τῶν πεπιστευκότων ἀπὸ τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων. Later on in *v.* 5 *D* and *c.Th.* are both interpolated. *D* has:

εξανεστησαν λεγοντες τινες
απο της ερεσεως των φαρισαιων
πεπιστευκοτες οτι δει.

Here the interpolation is obvious, since the words ἀπό . . πεπιστευκότες violently interrupt the connexion of λέγοντες ὅτι δεῖ κ.τ.λ.

For *c.Th.* I give White's Latin, which has:

> surrexerunt adversus apostolos existentes qui crediderunt de haeresi Pharisaeorum.

Here *existentes* = ὄντες, apparently a conjecture for λέγοντες. The addition *adversus apostolos* is peculiar to *c.Th.* and looks like an expansion.

Two minor points may be noticed in these verses.

In *v.* 4 the words καὶ ὅτι ἤνοιξεν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν θύραν πίστεως which occur in

xiv. 27 are repeated after μετ' αὐτῶν by δ. Blass, who considers them more appropriate here than in xiv. 27, follows δ here and strikes them out in xiv. 27.

The addition of σὺν τῷ πλήθει in *v.* 6 seems highly plausible in view of *v.* 12 ἐσίγησεν πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος and *v.* 22 σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. If so, δ, 𝕾ph, *Ephr.* appear to have preserved a στίχος lost by *D*, *cett.* Cf. *v.* 23 καὶ πέμψαντες *c.Th.*, δ : *om. cett.* (*D*).

16–18. In this passage = Amos ix. 11–12 the Hebrew and the LXX differ widely. James here follows LXX except for a few variations, the chief of which is that he omits the words καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος found after ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτήν in LXX. Both the Hebrew and the LXX have a full stop at the end of *v.* 17 (ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα) and have nothing corresponding to *v.* 18 (γνωστόν κ.τ.λ.). This is strongly in favour of the arrangement found in *D c.Th. A*, *Iren.*, by which the quotation from Amos ends with ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα, and is succeeded by a general reflection in v. 18. The meaning of the abbreviated reading ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος (*om. cett.*) is somewhat dark. The Revised Version gives 'who maketh these things known from the beginning of the world', with a marginal alternative, 'who doeth these things *which were* known from the beginning of the world'. The reader who seeks for 'dignity, force and charm' (cf. p. xxiii) will find them in the A.V. which follows *D* and its allies.

20 and 29. The Schol. Athous says ἰστέον καὶ τοῦτο ὡς Εἰρηναῖος ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κατὰ τὰς αἱρέσεις τόπῳ καὶ λόγῳ οὕτως περαιοῖ τὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐπιστολήν, ἐξ ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς εὖ πράξετε φερόμενοι ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, καὶ διότι ἐν ἑκατέροις τοῖς τόποις τοῦ πνικτοῦ οὐ μέμνηται. Ambrosiaster, a very acute judge, in his note on Rom. v. 14 says *constat quosdam Latinos porro olim de veteribus Graecis translatos codicibus quos incorruptos simplicitas temporum servavit*, while Greek MSS. were emended on subjective grounds. He points out that the readings of Latin MSS. are supported by Tertullian, Victorinus, and Cyprian. In his note on Gal. ii. 1 (Migne xvii, § 215) he ascribes the addition of τοῦ πνικτοῦ here to Greek sophists, who added a fourth command (*quae sophistae Graecorum non intellegentes, scientes tamen a sanguine abstinendum, adulterarunt scripturam, quartum mandatum addentes et a suffocato observandum*). This spirited attack upon the principle of the *Graeca veritas* is most remarkable.

The reason for the insertion of τοῦ πνικτοῦ was to make it clear that αἵματος referred to diet as in Leviticus xvii. 14, not to homicide. Cf. Aug. *c. Faust.* xxxii. 13:

> ut abstinerent gentes tantum a fornicatione et ab immolatis et a sanguine, id est ne quisquam ederent carnis, cuius sanguis non esset effusus.

Jerome on Gal. ii. 5 treats *et a suffocatis* as a mere variant, 'found in some MSS.' Gaudentius quotes *et sanguine*, *id est a suffocatis*, i.e. a gloss is added to explain *sanguine*. In the *Speculum* of Aug. (a genuine work,[1] not to be

[1] Both works are to be found in vol. xii of the Vienna Corpus. The spurious treatise, also called *De divinis scripturis*, is a valuable witness for the *Z* text in Acts, its chief affinities being with 𝕷p.

confused with the spurious work attributed to him) we find in his quotation *et suffocato*, but in his note on the passage he says :

> nisi ut observarent ab his tribus, id est ab eis quae idolis immolarentur et a sanguine et a fornicatione. Unde nonnulli putant tria tantum crimina esse mortifera, idolatriam et homicidium et fornicationem.

This comment shows that *et suffocato* (supra) is due to interpolation.

𝔏[g] has in *v.* 20 *ut abstineant a contaminationibus ydolorum et a fornicatione et sanguine* (without τοῦ πνικτοῦ) but in *v.* 29 gives *ut abstineatis vos a delibatis symulchrorum et sanguine et suffocato et fornicatione.* It thus preserves the *Z* tradition in v. 20, while in *v.* 29 it has been harmonized with Γ. The Clementine Vulgate (*vg.*[cl]) has in *v.* 20 *et fornicatione et suffocatis et sanguine* and in *v.* 29 *et sanguine et suffocato et fornicatione.* Wordsworth and White agree with *vg.*[cl] in *v.* 20, but in *v.* 29 give *et sanguine* [*suffocato*], saying '*suffocato* uncis ut glossam inclusimus'. The MSS. which they quote vary between *sanguine suffocato* and *sanguine et suffocato.* The first of these occurs in Cassiodorus, but is mere nonsense. I do not see how it is possible to treat *vv.* 20 and 29 differently. Either τοῦ πνικτοῦ (τῶν πνικτῶν) is genuine in both places or in neither.

The evidence for the 'Golden Rule' in *vv.* 20 and 29 is much the same as that for the omission of τοῦ πνικτοῦ, and I do not propose to discuss it. I do not feel convinced by Ropes's contention that it formed no part of Tertullian's text. His quotations (*Pud.* 12, *Apol.* 9) are concerned with τοῦ αἵματος, and he may have passed over the 'Golden Rule' as not germane to his argument (cf. p. xli). The evidence of Irenaeus and Cyprian is sufficient to show that it was found in the oldest Latin versions.

That the saying was an old one and not confined to Judaea may be seen from Isocrates, *Nicocles* 61 ἃ πάσχοντες ὑφ' ἑτέρων ὀργίζεσθε, ταῦτα τοὺς ἄλλους μὴ ποιεῖτε. Similar phrases occur in Tobit iv. 15 and in the Talmud.[1] In Evv. cf. Mt. vii. 12 and Lk. vi. 31. Other references are Didache i. 2, Theophilus *ad Autolycum* ii. 34, *C.I.L.* v. 8738.

33–34, 40. The authorities for the two στίχοι of *v.* 34 differ. Both are found in *D*, 𝔏[g], *vg.*[aqw], Ephrem, while for στ. 1 we also have the evidence of *C*δ, 𝔖, 𝔈. The first στίχος is omitted by ℵ*AB* and the second by Γ (*C*).

In *v.* 33 we are told that Judas and Silas, after bringing the letter from the Council of Jerusalem to Antioch and spending some time there, were sent back to Jerusalem. According to *D* (+*alii*) Silas changed his mind and stayed at Antioch, so that Judas returned alone. It is therefore not in the least surprising to find from *v.* 40 that Paul when starting from Antioch took Silas with him. If, however, *v.* 34 is omitted with ℵ*AB*, it is extremely odd to find that Silas, who in *v.* 33 has been sent away in peace, is still at Antioch in *v.* 40. Harnack says that 'it is most strange that in opposition to *v.* 33 it is presupposed that Silas was in Antioch'. Ramsay on the other hand remarks of the reading of ℵ*AB* that 'there is in the sequence of thought a certain harshness, characteristic of Luke when he wants to draw attention to a point, which led to the omission of ἔδοξεν . . . αὐτοῦ in the great MSS.' (p. 174). His theory is that

[1] *Quod tibi displicet, id alteri ne feceris* (Hillel).

ἔδοξεν . . . αὐτοῦ was original and 'deliberately omitted from the text from the mistaken idea that *v.* 33 declared the actual departure of Judas and Silas, whereas Silas did not avail himself of the permission' (*ib.*). He attributes the addition of μόνος . . . ἐπορεύθη to 'the Bezan Reviser'. This is somewhat complicated. I prefer to think the harshness and obscurity, which he thinks characteristic of the author, to be due to the unskilfulness of the abbreviator (cf. p. xxxii).

CHAPTER XVI

XVI. 12. The correction πρώτης for πρώτη τῆς (Γ) has been made by a number of scholars from Clericus to Blass.[1] It is indeed one which must occur to any scholar who has read Livy xlv. 29–32 where the division of Macedonia into four *partes* or *regiones* by Aemilius Paulus in 167 B.C. is described. The reading πρώτη τῆς μερίδος can only mean 'first of the part', not 'first of that part', as rendered in the A.V. The corruption is very simple. Thus J. Peirce, writing in 1725,[2] quotes a 'learned friend' who suggests that the difficulties of the passage 'may be easily removed by supposing that πρώτη τῆς through the inadvertency of some transcriber repeating the last syllable crept in for πρώτης'. It will be seen that the MS. evidence for πρώτης is very weak and wholly Latin, viz. one (or more) mixed MS. of the Vulgate and the Provençal version. This is a remarkable illustration of the dictum[3] that 'Ancient elements may lurk in the least regarded authority'. As, however, mixed MSS. of the Vulgate contain a large number of ancient variants drawn from O.-L. sources, it is very probable that this variant comes from a MS. similar to 𝔏p (cf. p. 285).

Livy gives a minute account of the four *regiones*.[4] The *prima pars* included the district between the Strymon and the Nestus, together with certain outlying districts. Each *regio* had its own capital. Livy says: *capita regionum, ubi concilia fierent, primae regionis Amphipolim, secundae Thessalonicen, tertiae Pellam, quartae Pelagoniam fecit.* We have coins of Μακεδόνων πρώτης, δευτέρας, τετάρτης (not τρίτης). In 148 B.C. Macedonia, which had supported the pretender Andriscus, was converted into a province. It had been generally assumed that at a later date, possibly under Augustus, the divisions made by Paulus were revived, but the evidence was somewhat nebulous. In 1900, however, Prof. Rostovtzeff published a highly important inscription from Beroea which removes all doubts.[5] It refers to a meeting of the provincial Diet (Μακεδόνων τὸ κοινόν) in the governorship of L. Baebius Honoratus, and in it the words συνεδρίου πρώτης μερίδος and τετάρτης με[ρίδος] occur. For συνεδρίου we may compare Liv. xlv. 32 (*senatores quos synedros vocant*). We know from

[1] Cf. Hastings's *Dict. of Bible*, iii. Philippi (C. H. Turner). Clericus said (*ad. loc.*) *suspicatus sum aliquando rectius fortasse posse hic legi* πρώτης μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας *sed contra codicum et interpretum vetustorum consensum mutari nihil velim.*

[2] *Paraphrase and notes on Epistle to Philippians*, pp. 2–3.

[3] A. S. Hunt, *Two Theocritus Papyri* (1930), p. 28.

[4] The best account of various subjects touched upon in this note is to be found in the masterly articles of H. Gaebler on the coinage of Macedonia in *Zeitschrift für Numismatik*, xxiii (1902), pp. 141–189 and xxiv (1903), pp. 245–338.

[5] *Revue Archéologique*, xxxvii (1900), p. 489, no. 130.

an inscription that Baebius Honoratus was consul at a date subsequent to A.D. 73.[1]

It is probable that the division of Macedonia into four parts lasted until it was superseded by a new division into two parts only, viz. *Macedonia prima* and *Macedonia secunda* or *Salutaris*. Mommsen is of opinion that this took place about A.D. 386.[2] This method of dividing provinces into two parts originated under Diocletian, and Macedonia appears to have been one of the last provinces to which it was applied. *Macedonia Salutaris*, which was situated in the north, bordering on Dardania to the north and Thrace to the east, was small and unimportant. Hierocles in his Συνέκδημος ('Traveller's Companion') *c.* A.D. 535 gives a list of 30 towns in Μακεδονία ᾱ— including Thessalonica and Philippi — in addition to the islands of Thasos and Samothrace, while Μακεδονία β̄ had only eight towns, none of which except Stobi was important. Μακεδονία πρώτη and δευτέρα are frequently mentioned in the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon in the previous century, A.D. 451.[3]

I now turn to the readings of *D*, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ and $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, which have one point in common, viz. that they make no mention of any μερίς.

D gives ητις εστιν κεφαλη μακεδονιας
πολις κολωνια.

If *D* stood alone, κεφαλή would seem to be an obvious Latinism ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ has *caput*). It is, however, supported by $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$, which has *quae ipsa est caput Macedoniae*. $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ gives *quae est prima Macedoniae civitas*, substituting πρώτη for κεφαλή. Though this sense of κεφαλή is strange, it might be defended as a Semitism on the analogy of Isaiah vii. 8–9 ἡ κεφαλὴ Ἀρὰμ Δαμασκός· καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ Δαμασκοῦ Ῥασίμ . . . καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ Ἐφραΐμ Σομορὼν καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ Σομορὼν υἱὸς τοῦ Ῥομελίου.[4] Another difficulty is that Thessalonica was the capital of Macedonia. This, though serious, is not fatal, since, as Turner remarks, 'Rome and things Roman were uppermost in the mind of St. Paul'. Philippi to him was 'not an ordinary Greek town, but a Roman colony'. Mommsen has an interesting remark in his chapter upon Macedonia,[5] where he says 'Thessalonika remained Greek and the capital of the country. By its side flourished Philippi, favoured by the Emperors as the seat of the battle which definitely founded the monarchy and on account of the numerous veterans who took part in it and subsequently settled there.' There is, however, a third difficulty, which is insuperable: namely, that the words πρώτης μερίδος cannot be dispensed with. If κεφαλή is to be read, they must be combined with it.

The question arises, can κεφαλή be used in any other sense than 'head' or

[1] *C.I.L.* xii. 3637 *Arrecino Clemente* ii, *L. Baebio Honorato.* The first consulship of Arrecinus was in A.D. 73.

[2] *Abhand. Berl. Akad.*, 1862, p. 509.

[3] Gelasius of Cyzicus, writing in the second half of the fifth century, when giving a list of Bishops who sent the decisions of the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325) to their respective districts, mentions Μακεδονίαν πρώτην καὶ δευτέραν, but he is notoriously inaccurate (Mansi, ii, p. 929).

[4] I owe this reference to Canon A. Ll. Davies. [5] *Prov.* i, p. 301.

'capital'? For information on this subject I turned first to Moulton and Milligan's Lexicon to the N.T., in which I noticed the following quotation from papyrus *Flor.* 50, 83 (A.D. 256).

επ' απηλιωτικη[ς κε]φαλης πρωτης μεριδος = 'Eastern extremity of the first division'.

The papyrus in question is a deed in which four brothers divide their common property into four parts. The occurrence of κεφαλή in connexion with πρώτης μερίδος is most remarkable.

Preisigke gives seven cases where κεφαλή = 'corner, or end of a plot of ground' ('*Ecke, Ende eines Grundstück*'), one of which is *Flor.* 50, 83. I quote e.g. *Strassb.* 29, 35, cent. iii, ἐπὶ τῆς λιβικῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ παραδείσου ('at the Western end of the fruit-garden'); *Petr.* ii. 38a, 21, cent. iii B.C., ἡ ἀπὸ ἀπηλιώτου κεφαλή ('the Eastern end of the property'); *Oxy.* 273, A.D. 95, ἐξ ἧς ἐὰν αἱρῆται κεφαλῆς.

A similar word to κεφαλή is ἀκρόγωνος, for which Preisigke quotes *Masp.* 67151, 112–14 (cent. vi).

εξ απηλιωτου ταυτης κατα τας αγρογειτνιας αφ' ου βουλεται τοπου και ακρογωνου των αυτων αμπελωνων εκ τετραεντου κυκλοθεν (= *prise dans la partie du vignoble qu'il voudra, dans le coin qu'il préférera, en lui laissant choisir entre les quatre côtés de la périphérie*).

In view of these passages I venture to interpret κεφαλή here as 'extremity', 'apex', or 'frontier-town', and to join with it τῆς πρώτης μερίδος which may have dropped out before τῆς Μακεδονίας. For the article at the end of a στίχος, as in the arrangement which I have adopted, cf. Acts ii. 30; vi. 9; x. 41.

It remains to add a few words upon the geographical situation of Philippi. According to the *Itin. Hier.* it was 19 miles from the frontier. Pliny, however, *N. H.* iv. 42, after describing Macedonia, passes on to Thrace and says *intus Philippi colonia.* Mommsen (*Prov.* 1, p. 301) speaks of Philippi as being 'in the region of Thrace proper'. Turner says, 'It was situated in eastern Macedonia, so near Thrace that it is sometimes spoken of as Thracian.'

I have noticed an interesting passage in Ammianus xxvii. 4. 8 where he says of Thrace, which he has compared to a *cornutum sidus*:

> ex angulo tamen orientali Macedonicis iungitur conlimitiis per artas praecipitesque vias quae cognominantur Acontisma, cui proxima Arethusa cursualis est statio.

Ex angulo orientali curiously resembles ἐπ' ἀπηλιωτικῆς κεφαλῆς of *pap. Flor.* 50, 83 (*supra*).

I have so far made no reference to Hort's treatment of this passage, which is somewhat peculiar. He makes no reference to the division of Macedonia and would seem to have been ignorant of the literature upon the subject. He says that 'μερίς never denotes simply a region, province, or any geographical division'. This is an odd statement in view of such passages as Strabo 567 (of Galatia) τριῶν δὲ ὄντων ἐθνῶν ὁμογλώττων κατ' ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἐξηλλαγμένων, ἕκαστον διελόντες εἰς τέτταρας μερίδας τετραρχίαν ἑκάστην ἐκάλεσαν. It is definitely disproved so far as Macedonia is concerned by the use of μερίς in Rostovtzeff's inscription. He says that πρώτη cannot mean 'first on entering the country' since it never

has this sense unless accompanied by what he calls an 'interpretative phrase'. This is disproved by Procopius, *Bell. Goth.* 38. 9, who describes Τόπηρος as πρώτη Θρᾳκῶν τῶν παραλίων (cf. note on xx. 4) without reference to any other towns. He concludes that 'there is doubtless some primitive corruption' and conjectures that Πιερίδος should be read for μερίδος, though he allows that 'the phrase ἡ Πιερὶς Μακεδονία does not occur elsewhere and would more naturally be applied to the more famous Pieria in the S.W. of Macedonia'. I abstain from criticizing these remarks.

35. This passage has already been referred to (p. xlviii) as an example of a long cut, in which picturesque details were removed by the abbreviator. The result of the abridgement is, as usual, to create obscurity, since without the words συνῆλθον . . . ἐφοβήθησαν the change of heart on the part of the magistrates is wholly unexplained.

Ephrem says: 'The astaritae (= magistrates) . . . of the city were appalled and terrified by the earthquake and learning the truth knew that the earthquake was really on their account, but they did not choose to admit it. They sent secretly to liberate them.'

c.Th. is only quoted for στ. 1–4 in which it agreed verbally with *D*. It is to be noticed that δ and $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, which otherwise agree with Γ, *cett.*, have retained στ. 7 οὓς ἐχθὲς παρέλαβες.

37–39. For the combination of variants in *D* cf. p. 184. $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ has *insontes* (= ἀναιτίους) *flagellarunt nos coram mundo toto homines Romanos*. Here ἀκατακρίτους is not rendered. It will not do, however, simply to strike out ἀκατ. in στ. 3, since ἀνθρώπους could not by itself constitute a στίχος. Also ἀναιτίους seems out of place at the beginning of a στίχος. It seems probable that it originally belonged to στ. 3 and, when driven out by the Γ variant, took refuge in the previous στίχος. If so, it is interesting to note that the transposition is shared by $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ (cf. pp. xl, 300).

In *v.* 38 the corruption αυτοισοι in *D* seems due to a conflation of variants, probably of αὐτοί, which occurs in the previous στίχος, with αὐτοῖς or τοῖς (cf. p. 186). In στ. 2 τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα (Γ) is oddly combined with τὰ ῥηθέντα in στ. 3. $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ has *dixerunt ducibus sermones illos qui dicti fuerant sibi*, which appears to be a rendering of τὰ ῥήματα τὰ ῥηθέντα in *D*, i.e. *D* and $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ have a common interpolation. The reading which I have printed is that of Blass. If it is correct, *D* has combined two other variants, τοῖς στρατηγοῖς and πρὸς τοὺς στρατηγούς.

v. 39. As this passage is extremely complicated, I begin with the reading of Γ, *cett.*, which gives for the whole verse καὶ ἐλθόντες παρεκάλεσαν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐξαγαγόντες ἠρώτων ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως. In place of this, *D* δ, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ have a much longer variant full of detail and extremely vivid.

As given in *D* the verse contains ten στίχοι, i.e. two more than those printed in the text of this edition. After στ. 5, ending with δίκαιοι, *D* has:

και εξαγαγοντες
παρεκαλεσαν αυτους λεγοντες

These two στίχοι repeat what has already been said and are suspiciously like the abbreviated version found in Γ, *cett.* $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, which omits these two στίχοι after

δίκαιοι, inserts at the end of the verse *καὶ ἐξαγαγόντες ἠρώτων ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως* (Γ). It appears therefore that both *D* and 𝔖ph have been interpolated from Γ, *cett.* The five lines *ἠγνοήσαμεν . . . καθ' ὑμῶν* are common to *D* δ, 𝔖ph, and Ephrem.

Ramsay remarks on this passage, 'The Bezan text hits off admirably the situation and brings out with much skill the naïve desire of the magistrates to avoid an unpleasant case by inducing the innocent and weaker parties to submit to injustice and withdraw from the city. One would gladly think this Lukan.'

CHAPTER XVII

XVII. 4–5. The position of *τῇ διδαχῇ* in *D* after Σιλᾳ in *στ.* 3 of *v.* 4 is clearly impossible. Blass transposes the words to *στ.* 1 after *ἐπείσθ.*, which gives a good sense. Cassiodorus quotes *credentes apostolis fidei probantur adiuncti*, where *fidei* appears to render *τῇ διδαχῇ*. Ropes very plausibly suggests that *D* has conflated two variants, *τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Σιλᾳ* (Γ) and *τῇ διδαχῇ*. In *v.* 5 we have two main variants, viz. *οἱ δὲ ἀπειθοῦντες Ἰουδαῖοι συστρέψαντες* (*D*) and *ζηλώσαντες δὲ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ προσλαβόμενοι*. These are combined in *E* δ, 𝔖ph, which agree with Γ in basis, but insert *οἱ ἀπειθοῦντες* later on in the sentence. *E* inserts *ἀπειθήσαντες* (*sic*) before *καὶ ὀχλοποιήσαντες*, where it occupies a possible place : δ places *ἀπειθοῦντες* after *προσλαβόμενοι*, an impossible collocation : 𝔖ph puts *τοὺς ἀπειθοῦντας*, an obvious conjecture, after *προσλαβ.* 𝔏g has :

> Iudaei autem assumptis forensibus quibusdam viris nequissimis et congregata turba.

i.e. it omits both *ζηλώσαντες* and *ἀπειθοῦντες*. For the absurd rendering in 𝔏d, cf. p. 217.

It is to be noticed that *D* omits *καὶ ὀχλοποιήσαντες*, which is found in all other MSS. It is clear that it has dropped a *στίχος*. Cf. xi. 2.

9. For this passage, cf. p. xxxvi. The citation from *c.Th.* as given by White is :

> ipsi quidem primores civitatis cum accepissent sponsores (dimiserunt eos).

If this is correct, the eye of a copyist would seem to have passed from *τὸ ἱκανόν* to *ἀπέλυσαν* in the next *στίχος* (*med. om.*).

Ramsay, who does not mention the reading of *c.Th.*, inserts <and the Politarchs> into his paraphrase before *λαβόντες*.

14–15. It seems to be generally assumed that Paul, after going from Beroea to the sea, i.e. to Methone or Pydna, took ship to Athens. If so, it is very odd that the name of the port is not mentioned as is usual in Acts. Also the language of *v.* 15 (*οἱ δὲ καθιστῶντες . . . ἤγαγον*) suggests a journey on land rather than by sea.

There was a Roman road with stations and organized services from Pydna to Athens by way of Dium, Larisa, Demetrias, Opus, Chalcis, Thebes, and

Oropus, the total distance being 222 miles.[1] Such a journey would present no difficulty to Paul, especially if he was accompanied by friends from Macedonia.

In *v.* 15 παρῆλθεν can only mean that he 'passed through' Thessaly without stopping to preach ($\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ has *transiit*). The word is used in this sense by Γ in xvi. 8, where *D* has διελθόντες.

The three στίχοι in *D*, παρῆλθεν . . . λόγον, are supported by the commentary of Ephrem, the text of which is somewhat insecure. Ropes has a strange theory that they owe their origin to a corrupt variant Θεσσαλίαν for θάλασσαν in *v.* 14.

28. It would be difficult to find a more typical example of a gloss than the addition of ποιητῶν in Γ, *cett.* It is the sort of note which any scribe would add. Thus Thomas of Harkel enters in the margin of $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ the reference '*ex Arato poeta*'. Jerome remarks *hemistichium in Phaenomenis Arati legitur quem Cicero in Latinum sermonem reddidit, et Germanicus Caesar et nuper Avienus et multi, quos enumerare perlongum est.*

34. Reference has already been made to the omission of a στίχος here by *D* (p. xxxii). In xiii. 50 εὐσχήμων is used of women, in xvii. 12 of men and women. In the papyri ἡ εὐσχήμων = 'lady', e.g. *pap. Flor.* I. 16. 20 παρέλαβον παρὰ τῆς εὐσχήμονος πρὸς ἀντλησμὸν βοῦν μίαν (A.D. 239). A special use of ὁ εὐσχήμων is for a magistrate, e.g. *Rylands* ii. 236. 15 εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ εὐσχήμονος (A.D. 256). As applied to an Areopagite εὐσχήμων is unnecessary, since his respectability was undoubted; as applied to Damaris, it serves to protect her from such suspicion as that of Ramsay, who thinks that 'she may have been a ἑταίρα, since no respectable woman would have a chance of hearing Paul' (p. 252). Ropes says that 'the omission in *D* of the name Damaris is probably somehow due to an attempt to excise the gloss (i.e. εὐσχήμων) in which the wrong word got omitted'. It is, however, not a word, but a line which has disappeared.

CHAPTER XVIII

XVIII. 2-3. In this complicated passage the reading printed in the text is substantially that of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, which has (*sec.* Berger):

et inuenit aquilam natione pon[ticum iu]
daeum qui in recenti uerant (*sic*) ab italia cum [pris]
cilla uxore sua et salutauit eos. Hii aute[m propte]
rea exsierunt ab urbe quod dixisset claud[ius]
uti omnes iudaei exirent ab urbe qui uene[rant in acha]
iam. paulus autem agnitus est aquilae [cum]
esset eiusdem artis et mansit apud eum. e[rant enim]
arteficio lectari.

(Buchanan gives *quoniam* for *cum* at the end of 6 and *arteiicio* in 8.)

The citation from *c.Th.* begins with σὺν Πρισκίλλῃ (*v.* 2) and ends at ἔμενεν πρὸς αὐτούς (*v.* 3). It agrees with $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ except that it omits ἠσπάσατο αὐτούς in *v.* 2 and has ὁμόφυλον καὶ ὁμότεχνον in *v.* 3.

[1] Cf. *Itin. Ant.*, 326-8; K. Miller, *Itineraria Romana*, Stuttgart (1916), pp. 573-8.

Γ gives (I arrange in *στίχοι* for purposes of comparison, beginning with *στ.* 4 of *v.* 2):

και πρισκιλλαν γυναικα αυτου
δια το διατεταχεναι κλαυδιον
χωριζεσθαι παντας τους ιουδαιους απο της ρωμης
προσηλθεν αυτοις
και δια το ομοτεχνον ειναι
εμενεν παρ αυτοις και ηργαζοντο.
ησαν γαρ σκηνοποιοι τη τεχνη.

Apart from minor points Γ omits *ἠσπάσατο αὐτούς* ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$); *οὗτοι . . . Ῥώμης* (*c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$); *καὶ κατῴκησαν . . . Ἀχαΐαν* (*D c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$); *ὁ δὲ Παῦλος . . . Ἀκύλα* (*c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$). In l. 4 *προσῆλθεν αὐτοῖς* is probably a variant for *ἠσπάσατο αὐτούς* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has *accessit ad eos et salutavit eos*).

D, apart from minutiae, agrees with Γ, except that it retains *καὶ* (*οι κε*) *κατῴκησαν . . . Ἀχαΐαν* with *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$. At the end of *v.* 3 *D*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ omit *ἦσαν . . . τῇ τέχνῃ*. The omission is, of course, due to accident. No interpolator could have invented such information, which is only found in this passage. Ramsay says darkly 'The explanation is a gloss which crept from the margin into the text. It is doubtless very early and perfectly trustworthy; its vitality lies in its truth, for that was not the kind of detail that was invented in the growth of the Pauline legend.'

5–8. $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ here has:

tunc superuenerunt a macedonia [silas et]
timotheus atque iterum cum multis fier[et uerbum]
et scripturae interpraetarentur contr[adicebant]
iudaei quidam et maledicebant tunc exc[ussit ues]
tem suam paulus.

In this there is no trace of the words *συνείχετο . . . Ἰησοῦν* which occur in all other authorities, including *D*. At the beginning of *v.* 6 $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ supports *D* and *c.Th.*, where Γ, *cett.* omit two *στίχοι*.

Two explanations are possible (1) that *συνείχετο . . . Ἰησοῦν* (Γ) and *πολλοῦ . . . διερμηνευομένων* (*Z*) are variants which are combined in *D*; (2) that $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ has omitted *συνείχετο . . . Ἰησοῦν* and botched by inserting *atque iterum*. The excellence of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ in this chapter is in favour of (1), but the words *συνείχετο κ.τ.λ.* give an excellent sense in *v.* 5, viz. that the coming of Silas and Timothy stimulated Paul to fresh exertion, and they do not look like an alternative for *πολλοῦ κ.τ.λ.* in *v.* 6.

In view of the numerous agreements between $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ and $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ (p. 302) it may be noticed that $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ has a curious transposition in these verses. After *συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ ὁ Παῦλος* it passes on to *στ.* 3–4 in *v.* 6 *ἀντιτασσομένων δέ . . . βλασφημούντων* (omitting *δέ*, to botch the construction) and then returns to *διαμαρτυράμενος . . . Ἰησοῦν* in *v.* 5.

At the beginning of *v.* 5 *D* is clearly corrupt. We must either read *ὡς* (*ὅτε*) *δέ* in *στ.* 1 or insert a connecting particle in *στ.* 2 (*συνεῖχέ τε* Hilgenfeld). $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ has *τότε*. At the beginning of *στ.* 2 for *ὅ τε* *D* has *τότε*, which is oddly placed;

if used here, it should come at the beginning of *στ.* 1, as in $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$. It is to be noticed that in *v.* 6 $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ has another *τότε* before *ἐκτιναξάμενος*.

In *v.* 8 there appear to have been two variants, *ἐπίστευον* (*-ευσαν*) and *πιστεύοντες τῷ θεῷ* ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$), which are conflated in *D*. The first of these has taken the place of *τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου* ($\mathfrak{L}^{h}$) in the previous *στίχος*. The place of *ἐβαπτίζοντο* is uncertain. In *δ*, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ the words *καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο* come at the end of the verse (after Χ*ριστοῦ*).

17. $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ here has *et gallio simulabat* [*se non ui*]*dere*. The reading of *D* is erased and nothing is now legible (cf. Ropes' note *ad loc.* His conclusion is one at which I had myself arrived and was confirmed by Dr. Lowe). $\mathfrak{L}^{d}$ has *tunc gallio fingebat eum non videre*. That Ephrem had before him a similar reading is shown by his comment *factus est* (a mistranslation of *προσεποιεῖτο*) *quasi non videns*.

Ramsay speaking of the omission of *οἱ* Ἕ*λληνες* by Γ says that 'inferior MSS. substitute a life-like and characteristic scene for one which is utterly foolish'.

19–22. There is great confusion in these verses, chiefly due to two irreconcilable variants in *v.* 19, viz. *τῷ ἐπιόντι σαββάτῳ* (*Z*) and *κἀκείνους κατέλιπεν ἐκεῖ* (Γ).

According to *Z* in its purest form as found in *c.Th.*, Paul comes to Ephesus in the company of Aquila and Priscilla: he then goes into the synagogue *τῷ ἐπιόντι σαββάτῳ* and preaches. He is asked to remain longer but refuses and departs, leaving Aquila in Ephesus, *τὸν δὲ* Ἀ*κύλαν εἴασεν ἐν* Ἐ*φέσῳ*.

According to Γ, when he came to Ephesus he left Aquila and Priscilla (*κἀκείνους κατέλιπεν ἐκεῖ*) and went by himself to preach. As, according to this reading, he had already departed from Aquila and Priscilla, nothing is said about his leaving them in *v.* 22.

In *D* *δ* and $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ the two strains are conflated in *v.* 19. It may be noticed that in *D* *τῷ ἐπιόντι σαββάτῳ* comes between *καί* and *ἐκείνους* (*κἀκείνους* Γ). In *vv.* 21–2 *D* has been generally brought into harmony with Γ, except that it retains *δεῖ με . . .* Ἱ*εροσόλυμα* with *δ*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $vg.^{aqw}$, $\mathfrak{S}$ (*om.* Γ).

The reading of the Sahidic deserves notice. In *v.* 19 it has *τῷ ἐπιόντι σαββάτῳ* with *c.Th.*, but the irrepressible variant, *ἐκείνους κατέλιπεν ἐκεῖ*, turns up in *v.* 21 between *ἀλλά* and *ἀπετάξατο*. Horner renders this reading as 'but he left those in the place, he took leave of them, saying'.

In *v.* 22 *c.Th.* again appears to have the *Z* reading in its purest form, viz. *τὸν δὲ* Ἀ*κύλαν εἴασεν ἐν* Ἐ*φέσῳ· αὐτὸς δὲ ἀναχθεὶς ἦλθεν εἰς* Κ*αισάρειαν*, where Γ, *cett.* (*D*) have *ἀνήχθη ἀπὸ τῆς* (*τοῦ* *D*) Ἐ*φέσου καὶ κατελθὼν εἰς* Κ*αισάρειαν*. The variants are combined in *δ*.

Ramsay interprets *ἀναβάς* as meaning that Paul went from Caesarea to Jerusalem, but it is incredible that so important an event could have been recorded so briefly. The natural sense is that he made a short visit to the Church at Caesarea before going on to Antioch.

27. For this important passage, cf. p. xlviii. The variants of *D c.Th.* on the one hand and of Γ, *cett.* on the other cannot have proceeded from the same person.

It is to be noticed that *pap. Mich.*, the first fragment of which begins in the latter part of this verse, agrees with *D* in omitting the words τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν διὰ τῆς χάριτος at the end of a στίχος in *D*. This *proprius error* points to consanguinity.

CHAPTER XIX

XIX. 6. In this passage the longer version found in *c.Th.*—supported (*ex parte*) by 𝔏p, *vg.*q, Ephrem—disagrees with the conception of γλῶσσαι in ch. 2, and agrees with the Pauline doctrine in 1 Cor. xiv that ἑρμηνεία is required to make them intelligible to the hearers. It is more natural to suppose that the words omitted by Γ, *cett.* (*D*) were struck out as inconsistent with ch. 2, than that they were introduced by interpolation from 1 Cor. xiv. Attention has already been called, on x. 46, where the reading of *D* has been erased, to the rendering *praevaricatis linguis* in 𝔏d, which appears to be founded upon the passage from Isa. xxviii. 11 (ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χείλεσιν ἑτέρων λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ) quoted in 1 Cor. xiv. 21.

For the probable reading of *pap. Mich.* in this passage, cf. p. 225.

14. Γ, *cett.* here have two notorious cruces, (*a*) Sceva is called a Jewish ἀρχιερεύς, (*b*) he has ἑπτὰ υἱοί, while in *v.* 16 they are described as ἀμφότεροι, the natural meaning of which is that there were two only.

The reading of *Z* in its purest form is found in *D* and 𝔏g. *D* has ἱερέως without Ἰουδαίου and omits ἑπτά, 𝔏g agrees with *D*, except that it adds *duo* before *sacerdotis*. *C.Th.* has a mixed reading, viz. ἱερέως with *D*, 𝔏g, and ἑπτά with Γ, *cett.* It appears to be certain that *pap. Mich.* has ἀρχιερέως, but the rest of its reading is very doubtful (cf. p. 224).

The first of these cruces is insoluble. No one, so far as I am aware, has attempted to explain the presence of a 'Jewish High-Priest' in Ephesus. The conversion of the seven sons in *v.* 14 to two in *v.* 16 reminds us of Carlyle's jest[1]: 'Does it not stand on record that the English Queen Elizabeth, receiving a deputation of Eighteen Tailors, addressed them with a "Good-morning, gentlemen both".'

The reading of *D*, 𝔏g gives perfect sense. Sceva was a priest and had two sons. In all probability he was a Jew, in view of Ἰουδαίων in *v.* 13 and ἐν οἷς in *v.* 14. The addition of Ἰουδαίου in *v.* 14 is unnecessary (cf. ii. 5 Ἰουδαῖοι): this, however, is a minor point.

I venture to think that the trouble here springs from a scribal error, viz. the substitution of ἀρχιερέως for ἱερέως. The confusion is frequent, as may be seen from ch. iv. 1 ἱερεῖς *cett. Tert.*: ἀρχιερεῖς *BC*: *sacerdotes et pontifices* 𝔏g (conflat.): v. 24 ἀρχιερεῖς] ἱερεῖς *E* δ, 𝔖ph: *sacerdotes et pontifices* 𝔏g (conflat.): cf. Tisch. on Lk. xx. 1, Hebr. x. 11. A glance at Bruder's Concordance will show that ἀρχιερεύς is far more common in N. T. than ἱερεύς. The figures for ἀρχιερεύς are Evv. 84, Acts 22 (= 106); for ἱερεύς Evv. 12, Acts 4 (= 16). A scribe, therefore, would easily substitute the more familiar word for the rarer.

[1] *Sartor Resartus*, iii, ch. xi (On Tailors).

I now come to ἑπτά. Greek scribes vary in their practice when writing numerals, sometimes writing them in full, and at others employing letters of the alphabet, e.g. ζʹ, or ζ̄, for ἑπτά. (Cf. xii. 10.) The figures for *D* are:

	Mt.	Mk.	Lk.	Acts
ἑπτά	6	0	5	2 = 13
ζ̄	2	9	1	2 = 14

(Bruder does not give any references for ἑπτά in Jn.)

I have long been of opinion[1] that ἑπτά in *v.* 13 is due to a confusion between ζ̄ (= ἑπτά) and ζ (*sim.*) = ζήτει (*sim.*), a critical sign, or mark of interrogation (cf. 'query'). This ζ would, of course, be attached to ἀρχιερέως, which is followed by ἑπτά in Γ, *cett.*[2]

In the observations which follow I have to record obligations to Preisigke's article upon ζητέω,[3] which contains (at the end) a number of references for abbreviations of ζήτει, ζήτημα, ζητητέον, chiefly as marginal notes affixed by an official to a list or register.

The usual symbols are ζ^η and ζ^τ ; ζ by itself is not so common.

There is also a cursive sign ·/. which is employed in the same sense. Thus Preisendanz in his Preface to the Leiden facsimile of the Palatine Anthology says 'ζητήσεως *nota* ·/. *vel* ζ^τ *locos multos instruxit*'.[4]

(*a*) I give first examples of ζ (z) and ·/.:

Pap. Oxy. 12, cent. iii (chronological work), col. 5 *l.* 13, has Ꞩ την κυρου ετη τριακοντα.

A similar sign is found before l. 17. In both cases the critical mark calls attention to a blunder.

Pap. Oxy. 16, cent. i (Thucydides). In this very early papyrus the sign ·/. is used col. ii. 3, 5, 10, 24 : col. iii. 1, 2, 40 to mark errors, as may be seen from Plate V. This is the sign which Preisendanz notes as frequent in the MS. of the Anthology. Preisigke includes the passages where *S* and ·/. are used in these two papyri in his list of examples for abbreviations of ζήτει.

Pap. Flor. 71, cent. iv (Land Register). In this *Z* is very frequent, also //. The official appears to have affixed *Z* to those tenants who were in arrears and // to those who had paid.

(*b*) ζη. This sign is more frequent. I quote as examples: *P. Oxy.* 1174, cent. ii (Soph. *Ichneutae*), col. ix. 12:

ζη οπισθεν ευιαζετ αμφι τον θεον.

The corrector altered ευιαζετ to -ζες.

Preisigke, *Sammelbuch*, no. 5124, A.D. 192 (list of workmen), l. 135.

ζη Πρωτας απ(ατωρ) μη(τρος) τ(ης) α(υτης).

The details about Protas required verification.

[1] Cf. *Primitive Text*, p. 97 : *Descent of MSS.*, p. 450–1.

[2] In *c.Th.* ἑπτά came after ἐν οἷς υἱοί. The change in collocation indicates that it came into the text *ab extra*.

[3] *Wörterbuch d. gr. Papyrusurkunden*, p. 646 (1925).

[4] p. cxxi, cf. p. cxiii.

Such marginal notes as ζη συμβ[ολον] = 'look up the receipt', ζη διπ[λωμα] in the same sense, are frequent.

Abbreviations for ζήτει, ζήτημα, ζητητέον also occur in the text, e.g. in *P. Tebtunis* 343, cent. ii (Land Survey), ζη occurs in verso ll. 3, 13, 15, 19, 22 and ζητ in l. 9.

(*c*) In minuscule MSS. ζ^τ and √· are the normal signs, e.g. in the Laurentian Aeschylus there are five cases of ζ^τ on one page (Plate XXIV left). Other instances occur in the Ravenna Aristophanes and the Palatine Anthology.

The following corruptions are interesting:

The MS. of Hesychius has the following gloss:

τεἶν: ζητεῖν. ἄλλοι δέ σοι.

Here ζητεῖν is a conflation of ζη with τεἶν (=σοι).

In the *Etymologicon Magnum* under ἀφύη ('small fry'), after a quotation of two lines from Oppian (*Hal.* I. 767–8), editors before Gaisford (1848) printed καὶ μεθ' ἑτέρους ζήτει στίχους followed by another quotation from Oppian (*ib.* 775–7). The Oxford MS. here has ζ̄, i.e. ἑπτά.[1] I owe this reference to Mr. Lobel.

The symbol *Z* passed from Greek into Latin. The *Anecdotum Cavense* in a list of symbols, all of which are taken from the Greek, e.g. *Oreon* (= ὡραῖον), gives: *Z. Zeta in incertis.*[2] So Paulus Diaconus says of corrupt passages which he could not emend *ad oram zetam quod est vitii signum apposui.*[3]

The earliest Latin MS. in which I have observed this sign is *Vindob.* 2160, cent. vi (Hilary), a MS. revised by Dulcitius of Aquinum.[4] Lindsay, who gives a list of MSS. in which it occurs, thinks that it was favoured by Insular scribes.[5] Thus in the Book of Armagh (cent. ix) it is attached to two consecutive lines on f. 8^r.[6] I have noticed it in the Oxford Primasius (Douce 140), cent. viii, which has ·ζ· (f. 18^v) as well as *Z* (ff. 12^v, 110^r, 112^r): also in Laud. Misc. 126, cent. viii (Aug.), in which on two occasions *Z* is combined with *R* = *require* (i.e. *Z R̸* f. 79^r, *R̸* ł (= *vel*) *Z* f. 77^v). Both of these MSS. are in Insular script.

I have discussed elsewhere the way in which Latin texts were corrupted by the invasion of critical signs, especially omission marks, from the margin.[7] Here I am only concerned with *Z*. I therefore content myself with a reference to a paper by M. Havet on a mysterious *L* which occurs frequently in MSS. of Varro, *de Re Rustica*.[8] It was supposed by Traube that this stood for *K* (= *Kaput*), a mark found here and there in MSS. to indicate an ancient chapter division; this, however, does not suit the facts, since the passages to

1 Gaisford by a curious error prints ἕξ.
2 Reifferscheid in *Rhein. Mus.* xxiii (1868) p. 128.
3 Lindsay, *Pal. Lat.* ii. p. 11 (1923).
4 R. Beer, *Monum. Pal. Vindob.* i. p. 23 (1910).
5 *Pal. Lat.* l.c.
6 Cf. Gwynn's facsimile of MS., p. 15 (1913).
7 *Descent of MSS.* 34–5 &c.
8 *Revue de Philologie* xxxvii (1913) p. 131.

which *L* is added are obviously corrupt. Havet therefore suggests that *L* is a corruption for *Z*, to my mind convincingly. In one case *L* has hidden itself in the middle of a word (between *bi-* and *-vium*). In two others *L* is combined with *laudabilior*, a gloss to explain its meaning.

So far I have, for the sake of clearness, not alluded to another interpretation which has been suggested for ἀμφοτέρων, viz. that it stands for πάντων. The idea that ἀμφότεροι can be used for πάντες is founded upon a note of Reiske[1] in which he collects a number of passages, chiefly from Theophanes, a Byzantine divine (cent. viii). It was attacked in 1897 by J. B. Bury,[2] who rejects all Reiske's instances on the ground that 'where ἀμφότεροι refers to more than two, there is always implied a twofold grouping'. He produces, however, 'true instances' from the poem on 'The Exploits of *Digenês Akritas*', cent. x. There is, however, other evidence furnished by three papyri, which I take in order of antiquity.

(*a*) Lond. 336, A.D. 167, of which Kenyon says, 'This is a loan by one person to five others (two of whom are priests of Socnopaeus), all being jointly and severally liable.' In the text, first the name of the lender (Pharion) is given, then those of the borrowers in the dative, followed by ἀμφότεροι ἱερεῖς . . . τοῖς πέντε ἐγγύοις (a curious mixture of cases). It is stated in a note that 'if this is to be interpreted literally only the two last-named borrowers are priests', but the suggestion is made on internal grounds that 'all the five were priests'.[3]

(*b*) Genève 67, A.D. 382. In this, four persons agree to rent a piece of land. After their names have been given, in the nominative, the greater part of a line is lost: then follows ἀμφοτέρων (*sic*) . . . ὁμολογοῦμεν κ.τ.λ. The scribe adds γραμμάτιον ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γραμμάτων (*sic*) μὴ ἰδότων. His own Greek leaves much to desire.

(*c*) Berlin 255. 4, A.D. 599. The document begins with ἐν ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. In it three persons, a shoemaker, a sailor, and a third party, contract for a loan. After their names, in the nominative, there follows ἀμφότεροι ἀπὸ τῆς Μεμφ[ιτῶν] χαίρ[ειν]. Ὁμολογοῦμεν κ.τ.λ. Curiously enough the Greek in this late document is superior to that in (*a*) and (*b*).

The conclusion to which these papyri point is that village scribes did use ἀμφότεροι in the sense of 'all', as suggested by Kenyon on (*a*), when drawing up legal documents, though they were somewhat uncertain about its proper construction. No evidence, however, has yet been produced which would justify us in thinking that the author of Acts, who was a good Greek scholar and, I venture to think, a stylist, would use ἀμφότεροι for seven persons.[4]

[1] Const. Porph. *de ceremoniis* (ed. Bonn.) ii. p. 500.
[2] *Class. Rev.* xi (1897) pp. 393–5.
[3] *Grk. Pap. in Brit. Mus.* vol. 2 (1898) p. 221.
[4] Cf. J. H. Moulton in *Class. Rev.* xv (1901) p. 440.

CHAPTER XX

XX. 4 ff. The sense of these verses appears to be that, when Paul started on his journey from Macedonia to Asia, i.e. to the Roman province of that name, of which Ephesus was the capital, certain friends, chiefly Macedonians, accompanied him. Meanwhile two delegates from Ephesus, Tychicus and Trophimus, had previously gone to Troas to meet Paul and his companions, among whom was the writer (ἡμεῖς), on their arrival from Neapolis (Philippi). After a stay at Troas the whole party went on to Miletus, where they were visited by the elders of Ephesus. I follow the punctuation of Lachmann, who puts a colon after Τιμόθεος.

For the readings of *D c.Th.* in στ. 1–2 of verse 4, cf. p. xxxvii. But for the evidence of *c.Th.*, which had both συνείποντο αὐτῷ and μέχρι τῆς Ἀσίας, I should have supposed that the words μέχρι τῆς Ἀσίας were an interpolation from *AE* δ, *cett.* (*om.* ℵ*B*), which took the place of συνείποντο αὐτῷ in *D*.

The very important variant Δοβήριος (*D*, 𝔏g) for Δερβαῖος (*cett.*) has already been discussed (pp. xlix–l). I confine myself here to supplementary details.

(*a*) The headquarters of the Δόβηρες were in Paeonia. The fullest account of their habitat is given by Plin. *N. H.* § 35, who says: *Ab hoc amne* (*Axio*) *Paeoniae gentes . . . montes Rhodope, Scopius, Orbelus. Dein praeiacente gremio terrarum Arethusii, Antiochienses, Idomenenses, Doberi.* Similar details are given by Strabo fr. 36. Stephanus of Byzantium, p. 234, says: Δόβηρος· πόλις Παιονίας, οἱ πολῖται, Δόβηρες. The name is sometimes mis-spelt. Thus in Ptol. iii. 12. 25 the MSS. vary between Δίβορος and Δήβορος; Hierocles (cent. vi) has Διόβορος, and Constantinus Porph. (cent. x), who made excerpts from him, has Διόβουρος. According to Demitsa the town was destroyed during the invasion of the Bulgarians and the modern Dojran, διατηρήσασα κατὰ μέγα μέρος τὸ ἀρχαῖον ὄνομα, built in its place.

(*b*) The settlement of the Δόβηρες in the neighbourhood of the *mons Pangaeus* is attested by Herodotus, not only in vii. 113, but also in v. 16, a passage suspected without reason by some editors. Further information as to a town Δόβηρος in this district on the road from Philippi to Amphipolis is given in *Itin. Hier.* 604:[1]

finis Rhodopeae et Macedoniae
mansio Hercontroma, mil. ix
mutatio Neapolim, mil. ix
civitas Philippis, mil. x
    ubi Paulus et Sileas in carcere fuerunt
mutatio ad Duodecimum, mil. xii
mutatio Domeros, mil. vii
civitas Amphipolim, mil. xiii.

[1] Cf. Miller, *Itin. Rom.*, p. lxx. col. 2, pp. 523–4 (map 164). I am informed by Mr. S. Casson that the latest Greek Staff map puts it almost at the same place on the site of a village called Voultsitsa.

It appears to be agreed that *Domeros* here = Δόβηρος. Thus Kiepert in his observations on map XVI (Graecia cum Macedonia et Epiro) says (p. 5, col. 2): 'Die Doberes, ein päonischer Stamm, sassen nach Herod. vii. 113 am Nordabhänge des Pangaeus-Gebirges, wo noch in späterer Zeit ihr Name in dem der *mutatio* Domeros (*Itin. Hieros.* 604) fortlebt.' Tomaschek, in his important article upon the ancient Thracians,[1] says: 'Δόβηρος (1) am Nordabhang des Pangaios. Domeros vii milia passuum Amphipoli *itin. Hier.* (2) in Paionia, auch geschrieben Δόβηρ, Δόβειρα, Einwohner Δόβηρες, Doberi.' He derives the name from the root *dhubh* = 'hollow', i.e. in a valley. For the interchange of β and μ we may compare Arcadius περὶ τόνων, ed. Barker, p. 20:

> τὰ εἰς ηρ ἐθνικὰ ἢ κύρια, μὴ συνεμπίπτοντα προσηγορικοῖς, βαρύνονται, ἴβηρ, ἀνίβηρ, δόμηρ.

Lobeck in his *Paralipomena*, p. 211, n. 5, says: *scribi oportet* Ἰλλίβηρ *vel* Κελτίβηρ *et* Δόβηρ.

Curiously enough, the same interchange occurs in the case of Δέρβη, the rival of Δόβηρος here. Steph. Byz. p. 225, 30–3, says that Capito (the author of *Anth. Pal.* v. 66) used the form Δέρμη. Suidas has the note Δέρμη· πόλις. Gaisford (i. 894) remarks: '*An* Δέρβη; *vid. Steph. Byz. Saepe enim* μ *et* β *confundi quis nescit? Lexicon tamen Regium MS.* Δέρμη καὶ Δέρβη· ὀνόματα πόλεων.' According to Adler, the latest editor (1928–31), an unedited glossary at Milan (*Ambr.*) has Δέρβη.

Before going further it is necessary to mention a third place with a similar name, viz. Τόπειρος, sometimes spelt Τόπηρος,[2] which was easily confused with Δόβηρος, e.g. Zosimus ii. 33, where Τοπήρου is a variant for Δοβήρου. This was situated in Thrace on the road from Acontisma to Stabula Diomedis, 26 miles from Philippi, and communicating with Abdera on the coast by a cross-road.[3] Procopius, who calls it ἀρχαία πόλις, says that it was taken by the Σκλαβηνοί (Slavs), but was rebuilt by Justinian. He describes it as πόλιν Τόπηρον ὄνομα· ἣ πρώτη μὲν Θρᾳκῶν τῶν παραλίων ἐστί, τοῦ δὲ Βυζαντίου διέχει ὁδῷ ἡμερῶν δυοκαίδεκα.[4]

I now turn to evidence furnished by the Acts of Church Councils, especially that of Chalcedon in 451.

At the Council of Sardica held in A.D. 347, where seven (or eight) Macedonian bishops were present, one of them, Gerontius, is described as *de Brebi* or *de Brevi* (Mansi iii. 39, 42). This is held to be a corruption of *Doberi* (*-o*).

At the Council of Chalcedon in 451, Eusebius, Bishop of Doberus, is continually mentioned. The lists of signatures and other documents are sometimes in both Greek and Latin, sometimes in Greek only or Latin only. In the Greek, Eusebius is always described as Εὐσέβιος Δοβήρων, Δοβήρου, or in one

[1] *Sitz. Ak. Wiss. Wien.* cxxxi (1894), *Abh.* 1, p. 72.

[2] Other spellings are Τοπειρίς (Ptol.), Τόπειρα (Suidas). Procopius has Τόπερος (κτισμ. iv. 11. 14), Τόπερα (ib. 4), Τόπαρον (ib. 11), as well as Τόπηρος (*bell. Goth.* iii. 38. 9). Curious corruptions are Otopiso (*Itin. Ant.*), Epyrum (*Itin. Hier.*).

[3] Miller, *l.c.* p. 524 (map 164).

[4] *Bell. Goth. l.c.*: cf. περὶ κτισμάτων iv. 11. 14.

particularly interesting case (Mansi vi. 847) Δουβήρου, which provides a parallel for Δουβήριος in *D*.[1] In the Latin *Doberus*, *Doberitanus* (*sim.*) are constantly confused with *Toperus*, *Toperitanus*. The confusion no doubt was originally due to scribal errors, but was increased by the folly of editors, who continually give *Eusebius Topiri* or *Topiritanus* where their MSS. are quoted for *Doberi* or *Doberitanus* (*sim.*). Lucianus, the Bishop of Topiros in Thrace at this time, was present at Chalcedon (as previously at Ephesus), and signs himself *Lucianus Topirensis Thraciae* (Mansi vi. 873). Consequently, all the cases where Mansi gives *Topiri* (*sim.*) after Eusebius should be corrected.

The Metropolitan of Thessalonica was not present at Chalcedon, and his place was taken by Quintillus, Bishop of Heraclea Lyncestis, who, as his vicegerent, speaks and votes early in the proceedings. The other Macedonian bishops come later on in the roll. It is a curious fact that Eusebius of Doberus always comes after Sozon of Philippi. (He is followed by Maximianus of Serrae.) I quote, e.g., Mansi vi. 609:

> καὶ Σώζοντος Φιλίππων καὶ Εὐσεβίου Δοβήρου Μακεδονίας πρώτης καὶ Μαξιμιανοῦ Σερρέων Μακ. πρώτης καὶ Ἑρμογένους Κασσανδρίας Μακ. πρώτης καὶ Λουκᾶ Βερροίας Μακ. πρώτης.

Similar lists occur elsewhere, e.g. vi. 578, 847, 930, 951; vii. 27, 401, 683. I abstain from mentioning here minor details about the number and order of bishops belonging to Μακ. πρώτη. The only representatives of Μακ. δευτέρα were Nicolaus of Stobi and Dardanius of Bargala.[2]

It is generally assumed that Doberus in these *Acta* was the town in Paeonia. I do not know what evidence there is for this identification beyond the fact that Hierocles in his Συνέκδημος, where he is following geographical, as opposed to episcopal, order, places Διόβορος next to Εἰδομένη, i.e. in Paeonia, and mentions no other town of that name in Macedonia. Also, there is no doubt that there was a regular order for speaking and voting in the Council. (Cf. Mansi vi. 1081 καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ πάντες τῇ αὐτῇ τάξει καὶ εἱρμῷ ὁρίσαντες ὑπέγραψαν.) On the other hand, the constant mention of Doberus after Philippi is interesting, when taken in connexion with the signatures from Lycaonia, in which—apart from the Metropolitan of Iconium, who comes early in the list—the invariable order is:

> Παῦλος Δέρβης
> Πλούταρχος Λύστρων.

Did the episcopal order sometimes coincide with the geographical? If so, the Doberus of the Council may have been the Domerus of the *itin. Hieros.* This, of course, is merely a suggestion, since our knowledge of Macedonian topography in cent. v is very defective.

The alteration of Δοβήριος to Δερβαῖος in Γ, *cett.* may have been due to the mention in the context of Timothy, who came from Lystra (xvi. 1), as well as to the unfamiliarity of the Macedonian place-name.

[1] Cf. Mansi vii. 127 Eusebio Topiris (*al.* Duberorum).

[2] Bargala is assigned to Μακεδονία β′ by Hierocles. In the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon it is described as Μακεδονίας without α′ or β′.

10–13. For this passage cf. p. liii. The transposition which I have made was suggested to me by the passage of Cassiodorus, which runs as follows:

> Ibi contigit ut unus adulescentium somno compressus de cenaculo cadens periculum incurreret, quem Paulus religiosa caritate complectens iis qui aderant reddidit sanum, qui se pane reficiens usque ad lucem praedicans populis inde ad Assoon terreno ⟨itinere⟩ profectus est.

The important point here is that Cassiodorus makes Paul bring up the youth (cf. ἤγαγεν in *D*) and then go on preaching until daylight, when he departed. The words ἀσπαζομένων δὲ αὐτῶν found in *D*, *om. cett.* (στ.), which are senseless where they stand, have an admirable sense if they come before ἡμεῖς, 'while they were saying farewell, we stepped into the boat'. (δέ after ἡμεῖς is an attempt at botching, which has been introduced from Γ into *D*: cf. xii. 22 ὁ ⟨δὲ⟩ δῆμος.)

I have recently noticed a remark of Harnack, who says: 'ἤγαγον δέ ... ζῶντα ought to have come earlier in the narrative, and in the following words, καί ... μετρίως, there is a change of subject'. Ramsay says: 'the sequence of the narrative is remarkable. *D* makes the sequence clearer, but there is a very harsh change of subject in *v.* 12.'

15. The celebrated reading καὶ μείναντες ἐν Τρωγυλίᾳ (στ.), found in *D* δ, 𝔏[g], 𝔖, 𝔈, but omitted by Γ*E*, with consequential botching (τῇ δέ for τῇ) in the next στίχος, has greatly impressed those who take the conventional view of the Γ text. Ramsay says of it, 'highly probable, for the promontory of Trogyllium projects far out between Samos and Miletus, and the little coasting vessel would naturally touch there'. Ropes remarks that 'the words are genuine and fell out by accident at some very early stage of the text ... the omission of δέ [in the next line] is a part of the reading'. For the attitude of the abbreviator towards minute details, cf. pp. xlv–vi.

CHAPTER XXI

XXI. 1. The omission of the words καὶ Μύρα by all authorities except *D*, 𝔏[g] *vg.*[w], and 𝔈 can be easily explained by ὁμ. (-ρα ... -ρα), cf. p. xxiv. Ramsay has a curious note upon this passage which I venture to quote. He says that 'there is no doubt that the ship either entered the harbour of Myra or went close to it.... The voyage was typical of a course which hundreds of ships took every year. The harbour of Myra seems to have been the great port for direct cross-sea traffic to the coasts of Syria and Egypt. It may be safely assumed that Myra was visited by Paul's ship as *D* asserts. But the addition of "and Myra" is a mere gloss (though recording a true fact), for it implies trans-shipment at Myra.' He concludes by accepting 'the authority of the great MSS.', and says that 'Luke did not mention Myra, because he was not interested in it, for some reason the visit to Myra did not interest him'. It might be maintained with some plausibility that the visit did not interest the abbreviator (cf. pp. xlv–vi), but it seems simpler to attribute the omission to ὁμ. At a later date Myra was the metropolis of Lycia.

15–17. In this very important passage *D* has been mutilated after ἐκ Καισα[ρείας]. This mutilation is ascribed to an unknown '*nebulo*' who

flourished between 1732, when *D* was collated by Dickinson, and 1793, when it was used by Kipling. It is fortunate that before this outrage took place *D* had been collated by several scholars, the most careful of whom appear to have been Wetstein and Dickinson. The only point of importance upon which the collators differ is whether πρὸς οὓς or παρ' ᾧ should be read before ξενισθῶμεν. Wetstein, who in his notes upon these verses is careful to distinguish between the readings of the first and second hands in *D*, says:

παρ' ᾧ] πρὸς οὓς *D a pr. m.*: *sed versio Latina* [= 𝔏ᵈ] apud quem.

A careless collator might easily have failed to notice the difference between D^1 and $\mathfrak{L}^d$. It is extremely improbable that any collator would have invented a discrepancy between D^1 and $\mathfrak{L}^d$ without reason. The evidence of *c.Th.*, which according to White's Latin had *apud quem*, does not help here, since the relative is indeclinable in Syriac.

For the omission of the words συνῆλθον . . . μαθητῶν (Γ, *cett.*) by *D*, cf. p. xxxiii. Ropes says (p. 203) that 'the omission is due to an oversight of the scribe'. On p. 204 he says that the scribe left out a στίχος.

I now come to the main point of this note, viz. the journey from Caesarea to Jerusalem and the role assigned to Mnason.

According to *Itin. Hier.* 600 the distances were:

ab Hierosolyma sic	
civitas Nicopolis	mil. xxii
civitas Lidda	mil. x
mutatio Antipatrida	mil. x
mutatio Betthar	mil. x
civitas Caesarea	mil. xvi.

We have now to compare the two traditions.

According to Γ, *cett.*, no halt is mentioned between Caesarea and Jerusalem. The part played by Mnason is odd. We are told that the disciples from Caesarea brought with them Mnason, with whom Paul and his companions were to lodge, i.e. at Jerusalem. This is a strange proceeding, since we learn from *v.* 17 that the brethren received them gladly. It may be noted that the construction of ἄγοντες παρ' ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν Μνάσωνί τινι Κυπρίῳ, which Scrivener calls 'elegant, but not very simple', seems to require stronger adjectives.

According to *D c.Th.*, the disciples conducted them to hosts, possibly for refreshment during their journey, and they spent a night in a particular village under the roof of Mnason. Then they went to Jerusalem, where the Church took care of them. The role played by Mnason is now intelligible and the difficulty of making a journey of 68 miles without a rest disappears.

There is no reading of the *Z* text which has arrested attention so much as this. To my mind there is none which is more obviously right. This, however, is not the opinion of Ropes, who says that 'the indefinite reference to the village is futile and over-emphasized, especially in view of the extreme interest and importance of the goal of their journey. As their village-host Mnason is wholly without significance: whereas as a resident of Jerusalem this old disciple was of real consequence to the narrative.' He also objects (so Scrivener and others) that Paul would probably spend as much as two nights on the way.

If so, the brethren from Caesarea would conduct him to another village-host, not so notable as the μαθητὴς ἀρχαῖος, Mnason. It is, however, to be noticed, as Blass points out, that the journey from Ptolemaïs to Caesarea, which was one of 44 miles, was made in a single day (*v.* 8); also that, according to xxiii. 24, 31, Paul was taken on horseback by the soldiers from Jerusalem to Antipatris (42 miles) in the course of a night, starting ἀπὸ τρίτης ὥρας. Ropes concludes with the remark that the fact 'that the party had to stop somewhere between Caesarea and Jerusalem is well within the glossator's possible knowledge'.

CHAPTER XXII

XXII. 29–30. The purest representative of *Z* here appears to be 𝔈, which puts καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔλυσεν αὐτόν after δεδεκώς in *v.* 29. This is supported by the quotation of Cassiodorus, viz.:

> Quo dicto perterritus solvit et imminentia tormenta suspendit. Alio autem die Paulum atque concilium Iudaeorum ante se praecepit adsistere, volens agnoscere qua causa sit traditus.

According to Γ, which has ἔλυσεν αὐτὸν καί in *v.* 30 before ἐκέλευσεν, Lysias in spite of his fear kept Paul in prison until next day. The variants are combined in 614 and 𝔖ph, which have καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔλυσεν αὐτόν in *v.* 29, and πέμψας ἔλυσεν αὐτόν (+ ἀπὸ τῶν δεσμῶν δ) in *v.* 30 before καὶ ἐκέλευσεν.

CHAPTER XXIII

XXIII. 15. In this passage *c.Th.*, 𝔏h, and 𝔈 have a longer text than that found in Γ, *cett.*

White renders the quotation from *c.Th.* thus:

> (nunc igitur) rogamus vos ut hoc nobis faciatis ut cum congregaveritis consessum indicetis tribuno.

𝔏h has:

> nunc itaque rogamus uti ho[c nobis]
> praestetis congraegate concilio et petite a [tribuno].

For *uti* (Berger) in l. 1 Buchanan gives *vos*.

𝔈 gives: 'And now we beseech you to do this for us. Gather together the council and say to the tribune' (Horner).

𝔏g has a mixed reading: it omits ἐρωτῶμεν . . . ποιήσητε with Γ, but retains συναγαγόντες τὸ συνέδριον with *c.Th.*, 𝔏h, and 𝔈.

It is to be noticed that 𝔏h omits the words πρὸ τοῦ ἐγγίσαι αὐτόν against all other authorities. This cannot be right; for omissions of 𝔏h in the later chapters of Acts, cf. p. 249. At the end of the verse the words ἐὰν δέῃ καὶ ἀποθανεῖν, preserved by *c.Th.*, 614, 𝔏h (*om. cett.*), appear to represent a στίχος in an ancestor. The same explanation may be given for the loss of the words συναγαγόντες τὸ συνέδριον (*supra*) by all MSS. except *c.Th.*, 𝔏gh, 𝔈.

23–4. In *v.* 23 𝔏h reads as follows:

> praeparate milites qui eant
> [. . . . .] usque in caesarea equites centum et pedites du
> [centos e]t ab hora noctis tertiam imperat ut parati

[essent ad] eundum et centurionib. praecepit uti iumenta
[praepar]arent et imponerent paulum et deducerent per noc

The folio ends here. At the beginning of l. 2 *armati* (Buch.) is a plausible supplement (ἐνόπλους *post* στρατ. two *minn.*).

The chief differences between 𝔏^h (for *c.Th.* see below) and Γ, *cett.* are as follows:

l. 1. milites] στρατιώτας διακοσίους Γ, *cett.*
l. 2. centum] ἑβδομήκοντα Γ, *cett.*
ll. 3–4. imperat . . . praecepit] *om.* Γ, *cett.*

I now come to the readings of *c.Th.* It must be premised that the text (𝔖^ph) into which Thomas was entering his marginalia is identical with that of Γ, excep that it adds εἰς Καισάρειαν before πρὸς Φήλικα with 614 and Ephrem.

The object of Thomas was to record two variants, viz. ἑκατόν for ἑβδομήκοντα (Γ) and the passage κελεύει . . . παρήγγειλεν (*imperat . . . praecepit*) omitted by Γ, *cett.* By some error, whether primitive or, as is more probable, due to accident in the course of transmission, the second of these variants was attached to the wrong place in the text, viz. before ἑτοιμάσατε in *v.* 23 instead of after ὥρας τῆς νυκτός. In this position it appeared to be a shorter version of a passage found in Γ instead of a supplement where Γ was deficient. Various complications arose which need not be dwelt upon here. The error is obvious to any one who compares White's edition with the reading of 𝔏^h. It was first rectified by Blass.

It may be noticed that *vg.*^w, which preserves κελεύει . . . πορεύεσθαι with *c.Th.*, 𝔏^h, omits the rest of the supplement καί . . . παρήγγειλεν, which they contained. It may be conjectured that the whole passage occupied two στίχοι in an ancestor. For the omission of εἰς Καισάρειαν before πρὸς Φήλικα by all MSS. except 614, 𝔖^ph it is noteworthy that in x. 25 the words εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν form a στίχος.

In *v.* 24 it cannot be doubted that the passage ἐφοβήθη γὰρ . . . εἰληφώς comes from *Z*. Cassiodorus has:

ne forsitan crederetur quod eum accepta pecunia a Iudaeis fecisset occidi.

CHAPTER XXIV

XXIV. 6–8. This very important passage has already been discussed (p. xlvii). The loss or excision of the words καὶ κατὰ (*v.* 6) . . . πρός σε (*v.* 8) in all MSS. except *E* 614, 𝔏^gp2 *vg.*^a, 𝔖 produces nonsense, since the evidence of Paul in his own case could be of no value, while that of Lysias, who made the arrest, would be of great importance (cf. *v.* 22). It is to be noticed that 𝔏^g has only a part of this passage, which clearly goes back to *Z*, omitting κελεύσας . . . πρός σε in *v.* 8. (Cf. *n.* on x. 25.)

24–7. It is to be noticed that *vg.*^boh, which agrees with *c.Th.* in giving ἥτις ἠρώτησεν . . . ἀκοῦσαι, omits θέλων οὖν . . . αὐτῇ, which rests upon the evidence of *c.Th.* (*sol.*). It is difficult to see how in a MS. written in στίχοι the passage could be arranged except as follows:

ητις ηρωτησεν ιδειν τον παυλον
και ακουσαι τον λογον
θελων ουν χαριζεσθαι αυτη

Cassiodorus here has:

post aliquos dies rogatus Felix a Drusilla coniuge sua coram ea Paulum fecit adduci.

This appears to be a summary, not a translation (cf. p. xli). It is, therefore, singular that Blass should have adopted it in preference to the reading of *c.Th.*, vg^{boh}. He gives *μετὰ δὲ ἡμέρας τινὰς Δρούσιλλα ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ Φήλικος, οὖσα Ἰουδαία, ἠρώτα ἰδεῖν τὸν Παῦλον καὶ ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον· βουλόμενος οὖν τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι αὐτῇ.*

In *v.* 27 there is a wide difference between the variants of *c.Th.* 614 and Γ, *cett.* The words *θέλων τε χάριτα καταθέσθαι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις* (Γ, *cett.*) also occur, with a slight variation of order, in xxv. 9, and may have been drawn from there. According to *c.Th.* 614, Felix wished to please Drusilla. Rendel Harris suggests that she may have been influenced by Atomus, the Jewish *μάγος* from Cyprus (cf. *n.* on xiii. 8). It is possible that she resented Paul's reference to *ἐγκράτεια* (*v.* 25) in view of her own career.

CHAPTER XXV

XXV. 23. $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ agrees with Γ, *cett.* in giving *ἀνδράσιν τοῖς κατ' ἐξοχὴν τῆς πόλεως*, while *c.Th.*, as quoted by White, adds *τοῖς καταβεβηκόσιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπαρχίας*. Blass saw that the words (*praem.* *καὶ*) should come in after *πόλεως*. The sense then is excellent, i.e. the court is attended, not only by the chief people in Caesarea, but also by notables from the country districts. Ropes, who says that 'the usual diacritical mark indicating point of attachment has been omitted in the text' of $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, considers the reading of *c.Th.* to be 'a gloss' which took the place of *τοῖς κατ' ἐξοχὴν τῆς πόλεως*. The use of 'gloss' as a description of *Z* readings is always objectionable as being inaccurate and question-begging. Here it is particularly inappropriate, since ⟨*καὶ*⟩ *τοῖς . . . ἐπαρχίας* cannot possibly be regarded as an explanation of *τοῖς . . . πόλεως*.

24–5. Our chief authority for the longer version of these verses is *c.Th.*, which is supported *ex parte* by the Book of Armagh ($vg.^{a}$) and the Bohemian version ($vg.^{boh}$). I venture to arrange the reading of *c.Th.* in imaginary *στίχοι*:

οπως παραδω αυτον εις βασανον
αναπολογητον·
ουκ ηδυνηθην δε παραδουναι αυτον
δια τας εντολας ας εχομεν
παρα του σεβαστου·
εαν δε τις αυτου κατηγορειν θελη
ελεγον ακολουθειν μοι
εις καισαρειαν
ου εφυλασσετο·
οιτινες ελθοντες εβοων
ινα αρθη εκ της ζωης.

ακουσας δε αμφοτερων
κατελαβομην εν μηδενι αυτον
ενοχον ειναι θανατου·
ειποντος δε μου
θελεις κρινεσθαι μετ αυτων
εν ιεροσολυμοις
καισαρα επεκαλεσατο.

Apart from small points *vg.*$^{a, boh}$ agree with *c.Th.* in *στ.* 1–9, the chief difference between *vg.*^{a} and *vg.*^{boh} being that *vg.*^{boh} omits *στ.* 7 (*ἔλεγον . . . μοι*) and 9 (*οὗ ἐφυλάσσετο*). In *στ.* 12–18 *c.Th.* is without support.

Γ, *cett.* have an abbreviated version, viz.:

βοῶντες μὴ δεῖν αὐτὸν ζῆν μηκέτι. ἐγὼ δὲ κατελαβόμην μηδὲν ἄξιον αὐτὸν θανάτου πεπραχέναι, αὐτοῦ δὲ τοῦ Παύλου ἐπικαλεσαμένου τὸν Σεβαστὸν ἔκρινα πέμπειν.
The abbreviator omitted *στ.* 1–9, recast *στ.* 10–11, omitted *στ.* 12, recast *στ.* 13–14, omitted *στ.* 15–17, and botched to provide a construction. All this is quite in accordance with his usual practice.

CHAPTER XXVI

XXVI. 7–8, 19–20. *Pap. Oxy.* 1597, published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1918, contains two short fragments of what the editors call 'an abnormal recension of Acts'. The first of these, which contains *vv.* 7–8 of this chapter, as supplemented by them, runs as follows:

το δωδεκ[αφυλον ημων εν εκτε
νια νυκτ[α και ημεραν λατρευει εν ?
ελπιδι κ̣[αταντησαι περι ης νυν ?
ενκαλου[μαι υπο Ιουδαιων ει ?
ο θ̅ς νεκρ[ους εγειρει.

The chief point of interest here is that *ἐλπίδι* in l. 3 agrees with 𝔏^{g}, which has *in spe pervenire* for *ἐλπίζει καταντῆσαι* (*cett.*). It is to be noted that *pap. Oxy.* has no trace of the words *τί ἄπιστον κρίνεται παρ' ὑμῖν* before *εἰ ὁ θεός*. The editors remark that 'the omission of a line containing *τι . . . υμιν* is an easy hypothesis'. (I may point out that the words would form an excellent *στίχος*.)

The other fragment (*vv.* 19–20) is given as follows:

[απειθης τη ουρανιω οπτασια α]λλα τοις ε[ν
[Δαμασκω πρωτον τε και Ιερο]σολομοις κα[ι
[τη Ιουδαια και τοις εθνεσιν] εκηρυξα̣ [
[μετανοειν και επιστρεφειν ε]πι τον θ̅ν̅ [
[αξια της μετανοιας εργα πρ]ασσοντας.

For *ἐκήρυξα* the Greek MSS. have *ἀπήγγελλον*, but 𝔏^{h} has *praedicavi* (𝔏^{p} in *App. Crit.* is a misprint), which is the usual rendering for forms of *κηρύσσειν*, and is here supported by 𝔖.

The question as to the proper supplement before *ἐκήρυξα* is of considerable interest. If *εἰς πᾶσάν τε τὴν χώραν τῆς 'Ιουδαίας καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* is read with *Eδ*, 𝔏^{g}, 𝔖, the construction is all right: if, however, *εἰς* is omitted with Γ, *cett.*, the

grammar is hopeless. Ropes says, 'As Greek, the text without εἰς is hardly tolerable'. Blass impugns both readings on the ground that as a matter of fact Paul did not preach all over Judaea, and reads εἰς πᾶσάν τε [τὴν] χώραν Ἰουδαίοις καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, with the support of 𝔏p2 and a similar MS. (*Colbertinus*). Grenfell and Hunt remark that *pap. Oxy.* 'was shorter than the current text'.

The editors say that the fragments represent 'a very ancient Greek text akin to the Western': also, 'that a piece of the "Western" text of Acts should make its appearance in Egypt is an interesting circumstance, but perhaps not very surprising'.

22–8. Attention has already been called (p. 249) to the number of omissions which occur in the last extant folio of 𝔏h, containing xxvi. 20 to xxvii. 12. Little importance, therefore, is to be attached to the omission of ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης in *v.* 22 or those which follow in *vv.* 23–6.

The passage of Tertullian referred to in App. Crit., on γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν Μωσῇ, occurs in *Res. carn.* ch. 39, where he says:

> proinde apud Agrippam nihil se ait proferre citra quam prophetae adnuntiassent. Ergo servabat resurrectionem quoque qualem prophetae adnuntiarunt: nam et de resurrectione mortuorum apud Moysen scriptum commemorans corporalem eam norat in qua scilicet sanguis hominis exquiri habebit.

The reference is to Gen. ix. 5, 'At the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man'. It is difficult to bring this into connexion with *v.* 23 here (εἰ παθητός κ.τ.λ.). The use of εἰ, apparently in the sense of ὅτι (𝔖vg has *quod*), is harsh. Blass remarks, '*neque satis est dicere* εἰ *esse pro* ὅτι'.

Reference has already been made (p. lii) to the absurdity of the reading με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι. Lachmann and Blass give πείθῃ (*A*), for which Blass compares πείθομαι (= *mihi persuadeo*) in *v.* 26. Cassiodorus here has:

> cui Agrippa iucunda mente respondit quod eum sub celeritate (ἐν ὀλίγῳ) vellet facere Christianum.

It is conceivable that *vellet* may point to a variant θέλεις.

30. 𝔏h here has, according to Berger:

> et cum [haec dixis
> set exurrexit rex et legatus et omnes assed[entes eis
> et secesserunt praefantes inter se de eo dic[entes nihil
> mortem dignum uel uinculorum homo iste [fecit.

δ has καὶ ταῦτα εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ (*om.* αὐτοῦ 614) ἀνέστη, while Γ, *cett.* omit καί ... αὐτοῦ and begin with ἀνέστη τε, botching to disguise the omission. 𝔖ph gives καὶ ταῦτα εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ ἀνέστη δέ, conflating the two readings. For similar conflations in 𝔖ph, cf. p. 316. At the end of l. 2 Buchanan gives *assen[tiebant eis*, which seems unlikely in view of οἱ συνκαθήμενοι αὐτοῖς in the Greek MSS. In l. 3 Zahn strangely takes *praefantes* in the sense of *praefati* (οἱ προειρημένοι), i.e. 'the aforesaid', a phrase used in legal documents, but very inappropriate here. It is to be noted that *praefantes* in 𝔏h stands where Γ, *cett.* have ἐλάλουν. Possibly 𝔏h had *praefantes* ... *dicebant* in place of ἐλάλουν ... λέγοντες.

CHAPTER XXVII.

XXVII. 1-2. As the variants in these verses are very complicated, the following details about the readings of *c.Th.* and $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ may be found useful.

White gives the quotation from *c.Th.* as follows :

> sic igitur iudicavit praeses mittere eum ad Caesarem. Cum die postero vocasset centurionem quendam, cuius nomen Iulianus, ex cohorte Augusta, tradidit ei Paulum cum et ceteris vinctis.

Nothing is quoted from *v.* 2.

$\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ has :

et ita legatus mitti eum ca . . .
et in] crastinum uocauit centurionem quendā
nomi]ne iulium et tradidit ei paulum cum ceteris cus
todiis] cum coepissemus nauigare ascendimus in nauē
adru]metinam ascendit autem nouiscum et aristar
chus ma]cedo.

The omission of the words *οὕτως οὖν . . . Καίσαρι* in *v.* 1 by Γ, *cett.* may be explained by the occurrence of *Καίσαρα* at the end of the previous chapter. $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ has an abridged version of *v.* 2, omitting *μέλλοντι . . . τόπους* and *Θεσσαλονικεύς*. On the other hand it preserves *ἀρξάμενοι δὲ τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν* with $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$. The words *εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν* are given by $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ only. It is tempting to arrange *v.* 2 in the following *στίχοι* :

αρξαμενοι δε του αποπλειν
εις την Ιταλιαν
επεβημεν πλοιω αδραμυττηνω
μελλοντι πλειν εις τους κατα την Ασιαν τοπους

with the notes

στ. 1. $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$: *om. cett.*
2. $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$: *om. cett.*
4. *om.* $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$.

5. The reading of $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ here is given by Berger as :

haec na]uigantes sinum cilium et pamphilium pelagū
xv di]eb. deuenimus. (Buch. gives diebus] xv.)

There can be no doubt that the celebrated variant *δι' ἡμερῶν δεκαπέντε* (cf. p. xlvi), found in 614, *vg.*[a], and $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, occurred also in $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$. Ramsay says of it : ‘This addition obviously suits the situation and may be unhesitatingly accepted as true, whether as written by Luke or as a well-informed gloss. . . . It perhaps dropped out of most MSS. as wanting interest for later years.’ I venture to say that the abbreviator who produced Γ was not interested in minute details and struck out the statement about the 15 days as cheerfully as he removed the mention of the seven steps in xii. 10.

For *sinum* in $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ White and Wordsworth conjecture *secundum* (so $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, i.e. *κατά*), but do not explain how the corruption took place. The ordinary abbreviation of *secundum* in uncial MSS. appears to have been *sc̄d* or *sc̄dm*. It may,

however, be worth while to mention that Prof. E. K. Rand has recently discovered an ancient nota for *secundum*, viz. *sn̄*, which might pass into *sinum*.[1]

11–13. The reading of 𝔏ʰ, as given by Berger, is:

gubernator autem
et magis]ter nauis cogitabant nauigare si forte possent
uenire p]hoenicem in portum qui est cretae, consen
tiebat i]llis magis centurio quam paulis (*sic*) uerbis et
cum flaret] auster tulimus celerius et sublegebamus

At this point the leaf ends.

Blass accepts this version, which he renders as follows:

ὁ δὲ κυβερνήτης καὶ ὁ ναύκληρος ἐβουλεύοντο πλεῖν, εἴ πως δύναιντο καταντῆσαι εἰς Φοίνικα, λιμένα τῆς Κρήτης, ⟨καὶ⟩ ἐπείθετο ἐκείνοις μᾶλλον ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης ἢ τοῖς ὑπὸ Παύλου λεγομένοις. ὑποπνεύσαντος δὲ νότου ἄραντες θᾶσσον παρελέγοντο.

Apart from the transposition of the words *μᾶλλον ἐπείθετο ἢ τοῖς ὑπὸ Παύλου λεγομένοις* from *v.* 11 to *v.* 12 (after Κρήτης), with consequential botching, 𝔏ʰ omits *ἀνευθέτου . . . οἱ πλείονες* and *βλέποντα κατὰ λίβα καὶ κατὰ χῶρον* in *v.* 12, and *δόξαντες τῆς προθέσεως κεκρατηκέναι* in *v.* 13. In view of the frequency with which 𝔏ʰ omits in this chapter, I cannot doubt that the writer of 𝔏ʰ, or of an ancestor, deliberately abridged the text in these verses.

27. I am surprised that the remarkable variant *προσαχεῖν* (= *προσηχεῖν*) in *B*, supported by *resonare* in 𝔏ᵍˢ, should have been so much neglected. For the use of the verb, cf. Plut. *Alex.* 31 *θόρυβος ἐκ τοῦ στρατοπέδου καθάπερ ἐξ ἀχανοῦς προσήχει πελάγους*: Philostr. 833 *τέμενος δὲ τουτὶ Ποσειδῶνος ἠρέμα τι προσηχοῦν θαλάττῃ*. All editors, so far as I have observed, have here adopted *προσάγειν* (*προσαγαγεῖν*), which does not seem an appropriate word. The instances quoted in Liddell and Scott for a 'seemingly intransitive use' of *προσάγειν* in the sense of 'to approach, especially in a hostile sense', are somewhat different, e.g. *προσάγειν κώμῃ τινί*. Cf. Zosimus I. 43 *ἐπειδὴ τὸν βασιλέα προσάγειν ἐπύθοντο εἰς τὴν μεσόγειαν . . . ἐληΐζοντο πάντα χωρία*. It is difficult to see how the word can be used of a fixed object. It was the ship that was advancing towards the island, not the island towards the ship.

Ramsay here remarks, 'the practised senses of the sailors detected that land was nearing: probably, as Smith suggests, they heard the breakers, and, as an interesting confirmation of his suggestion, one old Latin version [i.e. 𝔏ᵍ] reads "that land was resounding"'. In a note he adds, 'compared with *προσαχεῖν B*, as Prof. Rendel Harris suggests to me, this implies an early Greek reading *προσηχεῖν*'. Moulton says, 'The very attractive reading of *B* in Acts xxvii. 27 *προσαχεῖν*, which accounts for the variants, has the difficulty of being a Doric (&c.) form which disagrees with the common derivatives of the same root: *κατηχεῖν* and *ἦχος* are conspicuous in N.T. Can it have been a term used by sailors from Crete, Cyprus, Lesbos, Corinth, or some other maritime country outside the Ionic-Attic area, appropriated as a technical term?'

[1] *Speculum* ii. 2 (1927) 'A nest of ancient *Notae*', p. 168, Plate IV.

CHAPTER XXVIII

XXVIII. 16. The most frequent sense of στρατοπεδάρχης is 'commander of a legion', e.g. Josephus *B. J.* ii. 19. 4 (§ 544) Πρῖσκος μὲν στρατοπεδάρχης τάγματος ἕκτου, Λογγῖνος δὲ χιλίαρχος, ἔπαρχος δ' ἴλης Αἰμίλιος Ἰουκοῦνδος ὄνομα. A rarer sense is that of *praefectus castrorum*, e.g. in two similar papyri, A.D. *c.* 141 ἔγραψεν Οὐεργιλλιανῷ τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῃ πέμψαι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν κρίσιν.[1] For this sense cf. *Mart. Palest.* ix. 2 ὁ τῶν στρατοπέδων ἄρχειν ἐπιτεταγμένος. It is also used in a general sense for 'ruler', e.g. Eus. *H. E.* ix. 5. 2 στρατοπεδάρχης ὃν δοῦκα (= *ducem*) Ῥωμαῖοι προσαγορεύουσιν.

In the present passage $\mathfrak{L}^g$ renders the word by *princeps peregrinorum*. This was the title of a Roman official whose functions are known from a large number of inscriptions as well as from literary evidence. It is important to remember that the translation now represented by $\mathfrak{L}^g$ was in existence in the time of Lucifer, who used a similar text during his exile (355–62).[2] We do not know when this translation was first made: it may have been made some time before. What is certain is that its author was well acquainted with the position and duties of this official in his time.

As the facts with which we are concerned are now definitely proved and are set out with great detail in various works of reference,[3] I shall content myself with a very brief summary, avoiding minor points which have no bearing upon the custody of Paul.

Under the Empire certain officials known as *frumentarii* play an important part. Originally their task was to provide supplies for legions to which they were attached. At a later date they were employed to carry letters from provincial governors to Rome, and in course of time became part of the imperial police. Thus we are told of Hadrian (117–38) 'erat curiosus non solum domus suae sed etiam amicorum ita ut per frumentarios occulta omnia exploraret'.[4] An inscription from Ephesus (*C. I. L.* iii. 433) relates to a *frumentarius* who is described as a gaoler there.[5] They took a leading part in the persecutions of the Christians: cf. Eus. *H. E.* vi. 40. 2 ἀλλὰ καὶ πρότερον τοῦ κατὰ Δέκιον προτεθέντος διωγμοῦ Σαβῖνος αὐτῆς ὥρας φρουμεντάριον ἔπεμψεν εἰς ἀναζήτησίν μου: Cypr. *Ep.* lxxxi *frumentarios esse missos qui me Uticam perducerent.*

When *frumentarii* from the different legions came to Rome they resided in the *castra peregrinorum*,[6] which was on the Mons Caelius in the vicinity of S. Maria della Navicella, where many inscriptions relating to them have been

[1] *B.Mus.* 196: Wilcken 87.

[2] Cf. pp. 212, 268.

[3] E.g. Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung* ii. 491–4: Daremberg-Saglio (Cagnat) ii. 1348: Pauly-Wissowa (art. on *Frumentarii*).

[4] Spartianus, *Vita Hadriani* xi. 4.

[5] *Cornelio Florin[o] frumentario leg. x geminae Elpinius Festianus frumentarius leg. I adiutricis agens curam carceris.*

[6] Henzen conjectures that the *frumentarii* passed as *peregrini* in Rome: although they were Roman citizens, they generally resided abroad (*peregre*). It may be noted that in *C.I.L.* vi. 231 a person makes an offering to the Genius of the *castra peregrinorum* which he had promised *peregre constitutus.*

found. The chief officer in command of this camp was called *princeps peregrinorum*. We also hear of subordinates: *vice agens principis peregrinorum*,[1] *subprinceps peregrinorum*,[2] and *optio peregrinorum*.[3] When at Rome the *frumentarii* were employed by the *praefecti praetorio* in the execution of sentences pronounced by them: cf. Lampridius, *Vita Commodi* iv. 5, *praefecti praetorio . . . Saoterum eductum a palatio sacrorum causa et redeuntem in hortos suos per frumentarios occidunt.*

Lydus (cent. vi), *de mag.* ii. 10 says:

> τὸν πρῶτον μέντοι τῶν φρουμενταρίων, πρίγκιπα αὐτὸν σήμερον συμβαίνει ⟨καλεῖσθαι⟩, παρεῖναι διὰ παντὸς τῷ δικαστηρίῳ τοῦ τῶν πραιτωρίων ὑπάρχου καὶ πολυπραγμονεῖν καὶ τὰς αἰτίας ἐξερευνᾶν . . . ταύτῃ καὶ κουριῶσος (= *curiosus*) ὠνομάσθη ἀντὶ τοῦ περίεργος.

We learn from Ammianus Marc. xvi. 12. 66 that (in A.D. 357) the German prince Cnodomer after his defeat *missus exinde Romam in castris peregrinis quae in monte sunt Caelio morbo veterni consumptus est.* This supplies an interesting parallel to the detention of Paul.

We have not sufficient materials to say positively when the use of the *frumentarii* as police-officers and the institution of the *princeps peregrinorum* as their chief began. The earliest mention of *frumentarii* as spies (already quoted) refers to the time of Hadrian (117–38), to which may be added an inscription (*C. I. L.* iii. 1980) dated A.D. 170, under Marcus Aurelius, which refers to a *frumentarius leg[ionis] .ii.* Until recently the earliest known inscription in which the *princeps castrorum peregrinorum* is mentioned was *C. I. L.* vi. 354, in the reign of Severus (193–210). Some were of opinion that the system originated under Severus, but Mommsen thought that it went back to the time of Augustus. His divination now receives support from a new inscription (*c.* A.D. 100) which mentions a *princeps peregrinorum* under Trajan.[4] It may be noted that in the first century A.D. *speculatores*, who in the inscriptions are often mentioned in connexion with the *frumentarii*, discharge similar functions and act as executioners, e.g. Seneca, *de ira* i. 18. 4 *centurio supplicio praepositus condere gladium speculatorem iubet.* With them were associated members of the secret police known as *curiosi*, whose duty it was to act as informers, first mentioned in connexion with Hadrian (cf. *supra*).

It remains to say a few words upon the literature of this subject. The first step was taken in 1851 by G. Henzen, who by a skilful combination of the epigraphic evidence showed the connexion between the *frumentarii* and the *princeps peregrinorum*.[5] Thirty years later he published a second article, in which he completed his demonstration.[6] In vol. vi, part i of the *C. I. L.* (1876), for which he was largely responsible, he published under the heading *Tituli Peregrinorum et Frumentariorum* (pp. 785–91) a number of inscriptions (3324–66) found in Rome. In 1895 Mommsen, following in his steps, pointed out the connexion between his discoveries and Acts xxviii, where 𝔏g has *princeps pere-*

[1] *C.I.L.* vi. 428, 3326. [2] *C.I.L.* vi. 354. [3] *C.I.L.* viii. 1322.

[4] *Académie des Inscriptions* 1923, pp. 197–201.

[5] *Bull. dell' Instituto di corrispondenza arch.* (Roma) 1851 pp. 113–121.

[6] *Ib.* 1884, pp. 21–9.

grinorum.[1] He also suggested that σπείρης Σεβαστῆς (xxvii. 1) was a popular term for the *frumentarii* as a class, meaning that they were special servants of the Emperor. This clears up a difficulty, since a cohort is not elsewhere given a special name apart from that of the legion to which it belonged.

Ramsay says (p. 362), 'The failure in the great MSS. of the delivery of Paul to the Stratopedarch is a very clear case of omitting a Lukan detail which had only a mundane interest, and the failure of similar details in xxvii. 5 (δι' ἡμερῶν δεκαπέντε), xvi. 30 (τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀσφαλισάμενος), &c., may be estimated by the analogy of this case'.

The passage falls naturally into the following στίχοι:

ο εκατονταρχης παρεδωκε τους δεσμιους
τω στρατοπεδαρχη
τω δε Παυλω επετραπη
μενειν καθ εαυτον
5 εξω της παρεμβολης.

The abbreviator, impatient of all this detail, struck out στ. 1–2 and 5, botching by the consequential omission of δέ in στ. 3.

30–1. Our main authorities for the longer ending of Acts are 𝔏p and 𝔖ph. The chief differences between them are that 𝔖ph omits καὶ διελέγετο and διϊσχυριζόμενος (*confirmans* 𝔏p), while 𝔏p omits the words τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου . . . παρρησίας, which occur in Γ as well as in 𝔖ph. The position and construction of 'Jews and Greeks' is also different. Blass follows 𝔏p throughout, considering that 𝔖ph has been interpolated from Γ. The chief point concerns the genuineness of τὰ περί . . . παρρησίας. The words τὰ περί . . . Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ are not indispensable, but μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας to my mind adds greatly to the force of the sentence. It seems more probable that here, as in so many cases, the *disiecta membra* found in various authorities have to be pieced together.

The passage from the *Speculum* to which reference is made in the App. Crit. is (ed. Vind. p. 309, 6–7):

> Quibus praedicabat Paulus dicens: Hic est Iesus Christus filius dei vivi, per quem iudicabitur omnis orbis terrarum.

Weihrich supposes that this is put together from Acts xvii. 2–3 and 31. There can, however, be no doubt that it refers to the longer reading here.

Ephrem gives the following summary:

> Loqui cum Iudaeis et cum gentilibus qui ascendebant ad eum de Christo non cessabat et aiebat quod Iesus est filius Dei, quod pro eo laboramus et attinemus coronas.

As in the course of this work I have sometimes criticized the taste of the abbreviator, as shown in his excisions, I gladly confess that by omitting the words ὅτι οὗτος . . . κρίνεσθαι he achieved a stylistic success. Nothing could be more artistic than the abrupt ending ἀκωλύτως.

[1] *Sitz. Ak. Wiss. Berl.* xxvii (1895) pp. 491–503.

APPENDIX

I

Date of Acts

IN the last two verses of Acts we are told that Paul dwelt two years in his own hired house and preached, no man forbidding him. The tone is optimistic, almost triumphant. It had long been Paul's ambition to see Rome. He had now reached the capital of the Roman world, his teaching was tolerated by Roman officials, his disciples included members of 'Caesar's household'.[1] There is no hint that trouble was brewing when the writer of Acts closed his narrative. The situation was suddenly changed in A.D. 64 when, after the great fire of Rome towards the end of July, Nero, in order to turn suspicion from himself, accused the Christians of incendiarism and set on foot a horrible persecution. This date supplies a *terminus ad quem* for the composition of Acts, and until recently it was generally agreed that the book was written in A.D. 63. The traditional view is defended by Blass[2] and Harnack[3]; also by Mr. R. B. Rackham in an eloquent and, to my mind, convincing article.[4]

Various writers argue in favour of a later date, i.e. after the fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70), and suggest A.D. 75–80, or even A.D. 100. The chief argument is connected with a passage in Daniel x. 26–7, referring to the capture of Jerusalem by the enemy (*καὶ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸ ἅγιον διαφθερεῖ σὺν τῷ ἡγουμένῳ τῷ ἐρχομένῳ . . . ἀρθήσεταί μου θυσία καὶ σπονδὴ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων καὶ ἕως τῆς συντελείας καιροῦ συντέλεια δοθήσεται ἐπὶ τὴν ἐρήμωσιν*). Mt. (xxiv. 15) and Mk. (xiii. 14) refer to 'the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet', while Lk. (xix. 43), who does not mention Daniel or the abomination of desolation, speaks of Jerusalem as besieged by the enemy, 'who will cast a trench about thee and compass thee round and keep thee in on every side'. This variation in Lk. is held to show that the third Gospel was written after the fall of Jerusalem and the Acts later still. The flimsy character of this argument is pointed out by Blass.[5] Rackham well observes that 'Luke's expressions are quite general and describe the ordinary features of the fall and conquest of a city. Such a fate Jerusalem had already experienced more than once.'

A second reason advanced in favour of a date later than A.D. 63 is that the writer of Acts was acquainted with the works of Josephus, and on one occasion (v. 36–7) made a ludicrous blunder, due to carelessness when copying from him. This is a subject with which I have already dealt (pp. liv, 342–3) and I will not repeat here what I have said elsewhere. The fact that Acts so frequently dis-

[1] Phil. iv. 22.
[2] *ed. phil.* (1895), pp. 3–5.
[3] *Beitr. z. Einl. in das N.T.* iv (1911), pp. 63 ff.
[4] *J. T. S.* i (1900), pp. 76–87.
[5] *l.c.* p. 4.

agree with Josephus is sufficient to prove that the writer was not acquainted with the works of the Jewish historian.

The arguments for the early date of Acts are set out in such detail by Rackham and Harnack that I abstain from restating the case, since I could but repeat what has been said by them. I will only quote Rackham's remark that, if the Acts were written after the death of Paul, there is no climax. He says (p. 79), 'We should have a parallel case if a devoted cavalier and personal attendant of King Charles I, writing about A.D. 1660 a history of the Great Rebellion, should have stopped short at A.D. 1647 without having let drop a hint or a word to suggest the ultimate fate of the king.'

To my mind convincing proof of the early date is furnished by the attitude of the writer towards the Roman rule. The only danger of persecution comes from the Jews; Roman governors and soldiers are easy-going and even sympathetic. Renan says of him:[1]

> 'Il aimait les officiers romains et volontiers les croyait vertueux: une des choses qu'il admire le plus est un bon centurion, pieux, bienveillant pour les juifs, bien servi, bien obéi . . . Son estime pour les fonctionnaires romains est grande aussi.'

I also venture to quote a sentence from Lord Hewart, Lord Chief Justice of England, who in his Presidential Address to the Classical Association of Great Britain expressed himself thus:[2] 'It is not often stated, yet perhaps it is the fact, that the best short general picture of the *Pax Romana* and all that it meant—good roads and posting, good police, freedom from brigandage and piracy, freedom of movement, toleration and justice—is to be found in the experiences, written in Greek, of a Jew who happened to be a Roman citizen—that is in the Acts of the Apostles.'

I am myself firmly of opinion that the Acts were written before the events of A.D. 64 and regard this date as all-important for the chronology of N.T. writings.

There remains the question whether Paul perished in the Neronian persecution or, after being acquitted on the first occasion when he came into court, and revisiting Asia Minor, was again brought to Rome and put to death. The answer to this question depends upon the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles and of 2 Tim. in particular, which is attacked by many recent writers on historical and linguistic grounds. The subject is one on which I have an open mind. On the one hand, 2 Tim. seems psychologically true, i.e. it represents in the most life-like manner the effect of shock and disillusionment on a great mind. Also, it does not seem likely that a forger would invent details which do not agree with Pauline chronology in general. On the other hand the linguistic difficulties are very great, as may be seen from the exhaustive study of Mr. P. N. Harrison.[3]

[1] *St. Paul*, p. 133.
[2] *Proceedings of the Classical Association*, xxiv (1927), p. 21.
[3] *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (1921).

II

Λουκᾶς and *Λούκιος*

The name Λουκᾶς occurs three times in the Pauline Epistles, viz.:

Coloss. iv. 14 ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Λουκᾶς ὁ ἰατρὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς καὶ Δημᾶς.

2 Tim. iv. 11 Λουκᾶς ἐστι μόνος μετ' ἐμοῦ.

Philem. 24 Μᾶρκος, Ἀρίσταρχος, Δημᾶς, Λουκᾶς, οἱ συνεργοί μου.

The account which Eusebius gives of him (*H. E.* iii. 4. 6) is as follows:

Λουκᾶς δὲ τὸ μὲν γένος ὢν τῶν ἀπ' Ἀντιοχείας, τὴν ἐπιστήμην δὲ ἰατρός, τὰ πλεῖστα συγγεγονὼς τῷ Παύλῳ, καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς δὲ οὐ παρέργως τῶν ἀποστόλων ὡμιληκώς, ἧς ἀπὸ τούτων προσεκτήσατο ψυχῶν θεραπευτικῆς ἐν δυσὶν ἡμῖν ὑποδείγματα θεοπνεύστοις καταλέλοιπε βιβλίοις, τῷ τε εὐαγγελίῳ, ὃ καὶ χαράξαι μαρτυρεῖται, καθὰ παρέδοντο αὐτῷ οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, οἷς καί φησιν ἐπάνωθεν ἅπασι παρηκολουθηκέναι, καὶ ταῖς τῶν ἀποστόλων πράξεσιν, ἃς οὐκέτι δι' ἀκοῆς, ὀφθαλμοῖς δὲ αὐτοῖς παραλαβὼν συνετάξατο.

It will be seen that all these statements, except that connecting Luke with Antioch, are drawn directly from the N. T. It is therefore highly probable that Eusebius here gives an ancient tradition founded on the *Z* reading in xi. 28 *συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν* (in Antioch), which is omitted by Γ, *cett.*

The early Fathers detected supposed references to Luke in other passages where his name is not mentioned. The most plausible of these is 2 Cor. viii. 18–19, where the *ἀδελφός* sent with Titus to bear the Epistle to Corinth is described as *οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν· οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ χειροτονηθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν συνέκδημος ἡμῶν.* The identification of this 'brother' with Luke goes back to Origen.[1] It is difficult not to recognize the writer of the 'We' sections in the companion appointed by the Churches to travel with Paul. It is, however, improbable that the words *ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ* refer to the third Gospel or that Paul describes it as *τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου* (Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25; 2 Tim. ii. 8), as believed by Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome.

The name Λούκιος is found in two places, viz.:

Acts xiii. 1 Λούκιος Κυρηναῖος.

Rom. xvi. 21 Λούκιος καὶ Ἰάσων καὶ Σωσίπατρος οἱ συγγενεῖς μου.

In Acts xiii. 1 Lucius of Cyrene is mentioned together with Barnabas, Simeon, Manaen, and Saul as a prophet or teacher in Antioch. The passage must be taken in connexion with xi. 20 where we are told that converts from Cyrene came to Antioch and preached to the Grecians.

In Rom. xvi. 21 Lucius is coupled with Jason of Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 5–9) and Sosipater (Sopater) of Beroea (Acts xx. 4). Paul calls them *συγγενεῖς*, i.e. Jews (cf. Rom. ix. 3; xvi. 7, 11). Whether the Λούκιος of Rom. xvi. 21 is to be

[1] *Hom. 1 in Luc.*, ed. Rauer (1930), p. 10; Eus. *H. E.* vi. 25–6.

identified with the Λούκιος of Acts or not, is a matter of doubt, since the evidence is insufficient.

I now come to the further question, whether Λουκᾶς and Λούκιος are different forms of the same name.

Apart from a tradition mentioned by Origen, who says

> 'Sed et Lucium quidam ipsum perhibent esse Lucam qui Evangelium scripsit pro eo quod solent nomina interdum secundum patriam declinationem, interdum etiam secundum Graecam Romanamque proferri,'

this has been universally denied. Fresh light, however, has been thrown upon this subject by Ramsay, who found at Antioch two inscriptions, in one of which a person is called Λουκᾶς, while in the other he is called Λούκιος.[1] Ramsay concludes that 'Loukios and Loukas were felt as equivalent names by the Antiochian Greeks, one formal and the other familiar.'

There is, however, a further objection which is raised against the identification of Lucius with Luke, viz. that, while Lucius was a Jew, Luke was a Greek. This statement about Luke rests upon an inference from Coloss. iv. 10–14. In *vv.* 10–11 Aristarchus, Mark, and Justus are described as οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς. In *vv.* 12–13 Epaphras is mentioned as ἐξ ὑμῶν, i.e. from Colossae, and his services are described. Then comes *v.* 14, the passage about Luke and Demas quoted at the beginning of this article. It is argued that Luke and Demas are contrasted with those of the circumcision, i.e. that they were Gentiles. This interpretation is, however, contested by various writers. It is interesting to notice that it never occurred to the early Fathers, who were very much on the look-out for such details. If Luke and Demas were Gentiles, we should expect some notification of the fact as in the case of Titus (Gal. ii. 3) and Timothy (Acts xvi. 1). Also, the thread of thought has been broken by the two verses (12–13) devoted to Epaphras of Colossae. Origen in a note on Rom. xvi. 21,[2] where Timothy, Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater begin a new list of ἀσπαζόμενοι, remarks '*videtur mihi de istis quos sequestravit ab omni catalogo plus aliquid sensisse*'. This explanation may also apply to the present passage. Luke and Demas come last since they were especially dear to the writer.

It is allowed by those who are most emphatic in declaring that Luke was a Greek that both the works attributed to him are full of Hebraisms. Thus A. Plummer[3] says (pp. xlviii. ff.):

> 'When we consider the style and language of St. Luke we are struck by two apparently opposite features—his great command of Greek and his very un-Greek use of Hebrew phrases and constructions. . . . The author of the third Gospel and of the Acts is the most versatile of all the N.T. writers. He can be as Hebraistic as the LXX and as free from Hebraisms as Plutarch. . . .

[1] *Recent Discovery* (1915), 'The names of the Evangelist Luke' (pp. 370–84). Plates of the inscriptions are given (pp. 378–9).

[2] Migne, xiv, § 686.

[3] *International Critical Commentary, St. Luke* (1896).

In the Gospel itself (i.e. apart from the preface) it is simply a question of more or less Hebrew elements. . . . It will generally be found that the parallel passages (i.e. in Mt. or Mk.) are, in the opening words, less Hebraistic than Luke. In construction even Matthew, a Jew writing for Jews, sometimes exhibits fewer Hebraisms than this versatile Gentile.'

I find this theory of the 'versatile Gentile' very unconvincing. Greek was the literary language of the East and known to all Jews with any claim to culture. It is easy to see that a Jew when writing Greek would from time to time use native idioms and constructions. It is difficult to conceive the case of a Greek who became so saturated with Hebraic idioms as to use them when writing in his own tongue. If, therefore, the meaning of Col. iv. 10–14 is that Λουκᾶς was a Greek, it is hard to suppose that he wrote either of the works attributed to him.

III

Authorship of Luke and Acts

§ 1

The belief that the third Gospel and the Acts were the work of one writer rests in the first place upon the prologues addressed to Theophilus and the reference to 'the former treatise' in Acts i. 1. It was held by the earliest Fathers of whom we have any knowledge, e.g. Irenaeus and Tertullian. The evidence of the prologues was reinforced by the observation that there is an obvious similarity between the style of the two works, which are written in more elegant Greek than that employed in Mt., Mk., and Jn. Jerome says in his notice of Luke: *sermo comptior est et saecularem redolet eloquentiam.*[1] Of recent years various writers have endeavoured to tabulate and classify points of similarity in vocabulary and idiom which point to identity of authorship. I would mention especially Plummer in the preface to his edition of Lk., and Sir John Caesar Hawkins in his well-known work on the Synoptic Problem.[2] The evidence drawn from vocabulary and idiom has been strengthened by the supposed use of medical terms in Lk. and Acts, which are held to show that their author was a physician. This theory is chiefly associated with W. K. Hobart[3] and Harnack.[4] Ramsay[5] in his review of Harnack's book says:

'The importance of this book lies in its convincing demonstration of the perfect unity of authorship throughout the whole of the third Gospel and the Acts.... All difference between parts like Luke i. 5–ii. 52 on the one hand and the 'We' sections of Acts on the other hand—to take the most divergent parts—is a mere trifle in comparison with the complete identity in language,

[1] Migne, xxiv, § 97.

[2] *Horae Synopticae* (1899); ed. 2, 1909. I quote from ed. 2.

[3] *The Medical Language of St. Luke* (1882).

[4] *Lukas der Arzt*, 1906 (*Beitr. z. Einleit. in d. N.T.*, vol. i).

[5] *Luke the Physician*, 1908, pp. 3–68.

vocabulary, intentions, interests and method of narration. The writer is the same throughout.'

I have selected this statement on account of its uncompromising character: similar views, less confidently expressed, are to be found in a number of writers. There are, however, two distinguished authorities, Blass and Hawkins, who recognize a difference between the style of Lk. and Acts. Blass says[1]:

> 'Ipse Lucas quamquam etiam ex dictione facile cognoscitur eundem et Evangelii et Actorum esse auctorem, tamen in hoc altero libro et ἑλληνικώτερος evasit et aliis quibusdam assuevit vocabulis vel particulis, velut τε particulae, quae iuxta καί et δέ in Actis demum sententias conectere solet.'

Blass gives no reason to explain why Luke wrote better Greek in his 'second treatise', assigned by him to A.D. 63.

Hawkins, who accepts without discussion the traditional view of single authorship,[2] has a chapter on 'Differences between the language of Luke and Acts', a subject which he says had been hitherto neglected. He collected a considerable number of examples and summed up by expressing the opinion that, though the two books were works of the same author, they could not have proceeded from him at the same or very nearly the same time. He decides, therefore, that Lk. is considerably earlier than Acts, to which he does not assign a date. The objections to any date after A.D. 63 have been already stated.

I venture at this point to say a few words about myself. It is now several years since, when turning over for the first time Bruder's Concordance to the N.T., I happened to notice some facts about the distribution of the particle τε in the N.T. which startled me so much that I worked through the Concordance with special reference to the vocabulary of the third Gospel, the Acts, and the Pauline Epistles. At that time I was not acquainted with the literature upon the subject. Shortly afterwards I read Hawkins's book and found that most of my tabulations had already been made by him. Our conclusions, however, were different. He assigned the third Gospel and the Acts to one author, as already set forth. To me it seemed (1) that the similarities between Lk. and Acts had been overstated; (2) that similarities between Acts and the Pauline Epistles + the Epistle to the Hebrews had been very much understated; (3) that the differences between Lk. and Acts were of such a kind that they could not both be the work of the same author.

As I found these conclusions somewhat upsetting, I followed the advice given to authors by Horace in the *Ars Poetica* 388–90. I put my statistics aside, and renounced the inquiry, intending to resume it at a later date. This I did a few months ago with the result that I found myself confirmed in my original diagnosis. I therefore venture to state the case as it appears to me, though fully aware that I am likely to incur considerable obloquy as a dissentient from received opinion.

[1] *ed. phil.* p. 18.

[2] He says (p. 174): 'There is no need to reproduce here the abundant proofs of a similarity so generally admitted.'

§ 2

Before I begin the discussion I wish to make a few remarks on the proper method of inquiry:

(*a*) It is wholly unscientific to lump together the results for the third Gospel and Acts, which must be given separately. To attribute the total to 'Luke', when the distribution varies greatly in the Gospel and in Acts, confuses the issue and is a *petitio principii*.[1]

(*b*) The statistics from the Pauline Corpus must always be considered. Hawkins is well aware of this principle, as appears from scattered remarks, e.g. pp. xv, 189–93, where he dwells upon the relation subsisting between Lk., Acts, Paul, and Hebrews. In practice, however, he frequently ignores it. Thus, in his chapter upon 'The characteristics of Luke's style' he also gives statistics from Paul (+Hebr.), without noticing that the usages in question are common to Lk., Acts, Paul (+Hebr.), and cannot therefore rank as characteristics of 'Luke'.

(*c*) Vocabulary varies with subject-matter. Too much importance should not be attached to ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, the number of which (over 400) in Acts is very large.

(*d*) The most valuable evidence is that furnished by the use of particles, prepositions, conjunctions, and other small parts of speech[2]: also by variations in the use of common words, and in the choice between synonyms. Especial attention should be given to archaic idioms which tended to pass out of use in the κοινή, but survived in elegant writers.

(*e*) Any reader who wishes to test the statistics given below should have a Concordance before him. I have myself used that of Bruder, which is easily procured and has the merit of cheapness. Hawkins used that of Moulton and Geden (1897), which is founded on the text of Westcott and Hort, but quotes Bruder's statistics from time to time where Moulton and Geden fail to supply similar information. It must be remembered that the readings of the MSS. frequently differ, especially in the case of certain words, and a margin must always be allowed for errors.

I would further observe that the remarks made upon the affinity between the third Gospel, Acts, and Paul (+Hebr.) are not intended to countenance in any way the absurd theory that the Acts (or Lk.+Acts) were written by Paul. The evidence proves nothing except that Lk., Acts, and Hebr. proceed from writers who belonged to the circle of Paul and possessed cultivation similar to his. In all probability their language and style were also influenced by daily intercourse with their master.

[1] Rackham (*l. c.*, p. 76 *n.*) says of his own practice 'The Lucan authorship [of Acts] is assumed, though, as a matter of fact, many of the arguments would not be affected, if the reader were to substitute "the author of the Acts" for each mention of St. Luke.'

[2] Harrison (*l. c.*, p. 34) well remarks of such evidence 'Not only are the stones used by this builder of a different shape and substance, . . . the very clamps and mortar that hold them together are different too.'

§ 3

I now proceed to give a few typical instances to illustrate what has been said.

(*a*) I take first the case of τε.

This particle is particularly interesting, since it became rare in the κοινή. A similar phenomenon in the case of *-que*, which, together with *ac* (*atque*), gave way to *et* in vulgar Latin, has already been noticed (p. 208). Jannaris[1] says of τε that 'it began to retreat from the common language as early as post-classical times. N.T. writers—apart from the scholarly Luke—make but a limited use of it. In particular the combination τε . . . τε, so favourite with Attic writers, appears but rarely in the N.T. . . . On the other hand the combination τε καί appears not infrequently in N.T. Greek and even in the unscholarly compositions of the first post-Christian centuries.' Mayser,[2] speaking of papyri belonging to the period of the Ptolemies, says that 'the combination τε . . . τε is rare in the papyri and only found in documents which are highly literary in style.'

The references given by Bruder for occurrences of τε in N.T. (I omit here and elsewhere the Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse as not relevant to the present inquiry) are as follows:

Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
8	158	25	21	4	1	3

The references for Lk. are ii. 16, xii. 45, xv. 2, xxi. 11 *bis*, xxii. 66, xxiii. 2, xxiv. 20. Moulton and Geden, following Westcott and Hort, add xiv. 26, where τε (*B*) is an obvious error for δέ (ℵ*AD*).

The figures for Acts are somewhat uncertain, since there are many variants. Moulton and Geden allow 134 cases only. It is probable that the truth is somewhere between these figures.[3] The Epistle to the Hebrews occupies about one-fourth of the space taken up by Acts (or Lk.). In order, therefore, to compare its total with that of Acts (or Lk.) we should multiply by 4 ($21 \times 4 = 84$). Its record, therefore, approaches that of Acts. It is to be noticed that 16 out of the 25 cases in Paul come from Rom. and 6 from 1 and 2 Cor. Similarities between the language of Acts and that of Rom. and Cor. are especially frequent. The figures for Lk. do not greatly differ from those for Mt. and Jn. There is also a difference of quality as well as of quantity between Lk. and Acts. In Lk. all 8 cases belong to the τε καί type, which lingered on in the κοινή after the τε and τε . . . τε types fell out of use. In Acts, on the other hand, there are only 59 cases which belong to the τε καί type, as against 99 cases belonging to other types. Blass remarks on Acts ii. 40, where τε is used to connect parts of the sentence:

> 'Est hoc τε frequentissimum in Actis, rarum in ceteris libris N.T., etiam ab Ev. Lk. alienum.'

[1] *Histor. Grk. Grammar* (1897), §§ 1706–8.

[2] *Gramm. d. griech. Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, vol. i (1906), p. 177.

[3] W. Bauer's *Wörtenbuch* (1925) gives 150.

Most modern writers appear to be unacquainted with the facts about the obsolescence of τε in the κοινή, or pass lightly over the difference between Lk. and Acts: others suppress part of the evidence. Even Jannaris (quoted above), when speaking of 'the scholarly Luke' as an exception to the usual practice of N. T. writers, does not point out that he is nineteen times more 'scholarly' in Acts than in Lk., or that all the examples in Lk. belong to the τε καί type. Plummer (p. li) says of 'Luke' that 'his more frequent use of τε is another instance of more idiomatic Greek: [he then quotes the examples in the Gospel] only once in Mk. and 4 cases in Mt.' He does not mention Acts, Paul, or Hebrews. Bebb, in Hastings's Dictionary (iii. p. 70), says: 'A very striking, because obviously unpremeditated, illustration of the classical character of St. Luke's vocabulary will be found by examining in a Concordance the distribution of the use of τε in the books of the N. T.' He gives no further details here, but later on in the same page says, 'His fondness for τε, especially in Acts, has been already noticed.' This, however, appears to be his first mention of Acts in connexion with τε, and no reference is made to the prodigious difference between the practice in Lk. and Acts. A. T. Robertson,[1] who is acquainted with the facts about the disappearance of τε in the κοινή, for which he refers to Jannaris, after speaking of τε as 'a mark of Luke's literary style', goes on to say, 'In N. T. it is rare except in Acts where it occurs some 175 [*sic*] times. It is common to all parts of the book and is thus a subtle argument for the unity of the work.' I quite agree with this statement, but must point out that it is also 'a subtle argument', against the ascription of Lk. and Acts to a single author.

(*b*) I take next the particle μέν, of which Blass remarks[2]: 'The correlation of μέν and δέ which is so largely characteristic of the classical style is very largely reduced in the N. T., so that μέν is wholly absent from Apoc., 2 Pet., 1, 2, 3 Jn., 2 Thess., 1 Tim., Tit. (μέν in i. 15 is spurious), and Philem., and is practically unrepresented in James. It is also comparatively rare in Evv. as a rule and only occurs very frequently in Acts, Hebr., and some of the Pauline Epistles.'

The relevant examples in Bruder's list are distributed as follows:

Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
11	51	70	20	20	8	8

The figures for Hebr. are as remarkable as in the case of τε. It is to be noticed that 21 of the examples in Paul come from Rom. and 31 from Cor. (i.e. 52 out of 70).

The list given above contains all the examples recorded in Bruder's list, including two special classes, μέν *solitarium*, i.e. not followed by δέ, and the combination μὲν οὖν. The figures for these are:

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
μέν *solit.*	1	15	17	4	0	1	2
μὲν οὖν	1	27	5	2	0	0	2

[1] *Grammar of N. T.*, p. 1178 f.

[2] *Grammar of N. T.* (1898), § 77. 12.

μέν solit. is characteristic of Acts, Paul, Hebr. It may be noticed that six of the Pauline examples occur in Rom. and eight in Cor. The use of *μὲν οὖν* is characteristic of Acts.

(*c*) Throughout all periods of Greek literature there was a struggle between *σύν* and *μετά* (+gen.), the history of which has been traced by Tycho Mommsen in a monumental work of 824 pages.[1] He gives statistics for the use of *σύν* and *μετά* in the works of all authors from the beginning to the end of Greek literature. Those for the N.T. are given on p. 395.

In N.T. times *σύν* was in full retreat before its victorious rival, as appears from the following statistics, founded on Bruder's lists.

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
μετά	52	37	70	14	60	45	42
σύν	26	51	39	0	4	5	3

It is only in Acts that *σύν* is more frequent than *μετά*: it is, however, frequent in Lk. and Paul (Rom. 4, Cor. 14). There is no example of *σύν* in Hebr., or in the Pastoral Epistles.

Hobart (cf. p. 405) absurdly suggests that 'Luke's' use of *σύν* was due to the fact that 'in his professional practice he would have been in the constant habit of employing this word as it was almost always used in the formula of a prescription, and thus became an almost indispensable word to a physician'.

(*d*) Blass points out in his note on Acts xxi. 39 that in the N.T. the classical distinction between *ἄνθρωπος* and *ἀνήρ* is not always observed.

The figures for these words are:

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
ἀνήρ	27	101	60	0	8	4	8
ἄνθρωπος	100	46	124	10	118	56	59

It is only in Acts that *ἀνήρ* is predominant. It is also frequent in Paul (Rom. 9 exx., 1 Cor. 33) and Lk., while Hebr. here again breaks away from its usual companions. In Mt., Mk., Jn., *ἀνήρ* is rare.

Plummer's comment on these facts is (p. lx): 'The word is very much more frequent in Lk. than in all the other Gospels together.' What he means by Lk. here is not clear. He does not mention Paul at all.

§ 4. Agreements of Lk., Acts, Paul (+Hebr.)

Two very important cases, *ἀνήρ* and *σύν*, have already been discussed. Others are:

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
ἐνώπιον[2]	21	15	17	2	0	0	1
ὁ + word before noun	7	20	58	4	0	0	1
ὅς attracted	11	23	18	3	2	1	8

[1] *Beiträge z. d. Lehre v. d. gr. Präpositionen* (1895).

[2] Plummer (p. lx) speaks of 'Lk.'s' fondness for *ἐνώπιον*, of which he says there are 'more than 30 exx. in Lk. and Acts'. He omits to mention the statistics for Paul. This is a typical case.

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
πράσσειν	6	13	18	0	0	0	2
τις + subst.	33	70	24	5	3	3	6
τό, τά before prep.	8	15	23	1	1	1	0
τό + inf.	71	50	107	21	24	16	4
τοῦ + inf.	25	23	19	3	6	1	0
τυγχάνειν	2	5	4	2	0	0	0
ὑπάρχειν	7	26	15	0	0	0	0
χαρίζεσθαι	3	4	15	0	0	0	0

The case of πράσσειν is interesting. Blass says on Acts xvi. 28 that μηδὲν πράξῃς stands for the Attic μηδὲν ποιήσῃς, and on Acts xv. 29 εὖ πράξετε remarks '*nisi quidem confudit Lucas* ποιεῖν *et* πράττειν, *tum* εὖ (*quod rarum in N.T.*) *et* καλῶς'. The verb πράττειν shows symptoms of sickness (cf. p. 208). The corresponding figures for ποιεῖν are:

Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
86	71	81	19	87	49	103

The statistics for οἰκία and οἶκος are interesting, viz.:

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
οἰκία	23	12	8	0	26	19	5
οἶκος	32	25	15	11	11	12	5

Lk., Acts, and Paul prefer οἶκος, while this is the only form used in Hebr.

§ 5. Agreements of Acts, Paul (+ Hebr.) against Evv. (Lk.)

In the following statistics I group Lk. with Evv. to bring out its connexion with Mt., Mk., Jn. In many cases Hebr. has no example of the word in question, so its agreements with Acts and Paul, where they exist, are added separately.

(*a*) Words not found in Acts + Paul:

	Mt.	Mk.	Lk.	Jn.
πόθεν	5	3	4	13
μακρόθεν	2	5	4	0
πότε	7	5	4	2
ὑπάγω	20	15	6	33

These words are absent from Hebr. The most interesting of them is ὑπάγω, which is characteristic of the κοινή.

(*b*) Words rare in Acts + Paul (or absent from one of them):

	Acts	Paul	Mt.	Mk.	Lk.	Jn.
ἀκολουθεῖν	4	1	25	20	17	19
ἀφιέναι	3	5	37	34	34	13
βάλλειν	5	0	36	20	19	18
μνημεῖον	1	0	7	9	10	16
παιδίον	0	1	18	12	14	3
ὧδε	2	2	17	10	16	5

Hebr. has two exx. of ἀφιέναι, three of παιδίον, and two of ὧδε.

(*c*) Words not found in Evv.:

	Acts	Paul
ἐλπίς	8	35
ἐπικαλεῖσθαι (+acc.)	11	6
ἡμέτερος	3	4
καταντᾶν	9	4
μάλιστα	3	8
ξενίζειν	7	4
παρρησιάζεσθαι	11	6
χρῆσθαι	2	9

Hebr. has five examples of ἐλπίς; the absence of the word from Evv. is very singular.

(*d*) Words rare in Evv.:

	Acts	Paul	Mt.	Mk.	Lk.	Jn.
ἀναλαμβάνειν	8	4	0	1	0	0
ἄχρι	16	15	1	0	4	0
βούλεσθαι	14	19	2	1	2	1
διό	10	28	1	0	2	0
διότι	5	10	0	0	3	0
ἐπιμένειν	8	9	0	0	0	1 (?)
συνέρχεσθαι	17	8[1]	1	3	2	0
τέρας	9	3	1	1	0	1

Hebr. has three exx. of ἄχρι, one of βούλεσθαι, nine of διό (a very large number), two of διότι, one of συνέρχεσθαι, and one of τέρας.

I have not included in these lists words the frequency of which in Acts + Paul may be due to subject-matter, e.g.:

	Acts	Paul	Evv.
ἐπαγγελία	8	28	1 (Lk.)
καταγγέλλειν	11	7	0
μάρτυς	13	9	4 (Mt. 2, Mk. 1, Lk. 1)

Hebr. has fourteen exx. of ἐπαγγελία (a very large number) and one of μάρτυς.

The most interesting word in (*d*) is βούλεσθαι, since this was superseded in the κοινή by θέλειν, the register for which is:

Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Lk.	Jn.
16	62	4	42	25	28	23

These figures should be compared with those for βούλεσθαι (*supr.*).

(*e*) διά + genitive. This construction is more frequent in Acts, Paul, Hebr., than elsewhere, as will be seen from the following figures:

Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Lk.	Jn.
51	198	40	25	11	15	15

The record for Hebr. is very striking.

[1] All these cases occur in 1 Cor.

§ 6. Agreements between Lk. and Acts

The chief cases are:

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
ἅπας	20	16	2	0	3	4	0
εἶπεν δέ	59	15 (17)	0	0	1	1	2 (5)
ἐφιστάναι	7	11	3	0	0	0	0
ἱκανός	10	19	6	0	3	3	0
καλούμενος	11	13	0	0	0	0	0
ὀνόματι	5	22	0	0	1	1	0
πλῆθος	8	17	0	1	0	2	2
πρός + acc. after *λέγειν* (*sim.*)	99	52	2	6 (?)	0	5	19
ὡς (= when)	19	29	3	0	0	0	17
ὡσεί with num.	6	6	0	0	1	1	4

The most important of these are *εἶπεν δέ*, *καλούμενος*, *πρός τινα λέγειν* (cf. Jn.), *ὡς* (cf. Jn.). I am not sure that *ὀνόματι* should figure in this list, since the exx. in Lk. are so few.

The rarity or absence of the following words may be noticed:

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
λυπεῖν	0	0	15	0	6	2	2
λυπή	1	0	8	1	0	0	4
πάλιν	3	6	29	10	17	29	47

The frequency of *πάλιν* in Hebr. is remarkable.

Some writers lay stress upon the use of *ἐγένετο* + a finite verb or + *καί*, or + an infinitive in Lk. and Acts. Thus Bebb says that these constructions are 'almost confined to St. Luke, in whose writings they are found more than 50 times'. The actual figures are:

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
ἐγένετο + finite verb	22	0	0	0	0	2	0
+ *καί*	11	1 (?)	0	0	1	0	0
+ inf.	5	16	0	0	0	1	0

Plummer (p. 45) has a valuable discussion of these constructions. He says that *ἐγένετο* + finite verb and *ἐγένετο* + *καί* are Hebraistic types, which are avoided in Acts. The more classical construction with the infinitive occurs frequently in Acts and less frequently in Lk.

§ 7. Characteristics of Acts

The most important of these, *τε*, *μέν*, *σύν*, *ἀνήρ*, have been already dealt with. Others which deserve notice are:

(1) Rarity of ἐάν, ὃς ἄν, ὅταν.

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
ἐάν	30	6	74	5	60	33	43
ὃς ἄν	20	4	11	0	39	21	5
ὅταν	29	2	33	1	19	20	17

(2) Frequency of ὅπως (shared with Mt.).

Jannaris says (§ 1761) that ὅπως disappeared as a final conjunction soon after the close of the Attic period (so also ὡς) and ἵνα became the almost universal means of expressing final relation. This excess in use of ἵνα led to a reaction in the late Graeco-Roman period. Even Aristotle uses almost exclusively ἵνα. He gives tables from Thuc., Xen. *Anab.* i–iii, Polybius i–v, and N.T. (so far as Coloss.) to illustrate the process:

	ἵνα	ὅπως	ὡς
Thuc.	53	156	2
Xen.	96	156	84
Polyb.	62	0	0
N.T.	493	52	0

Bruder gives the following exx.

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
ἵνα	38	12	208	13	34	58	125
ὅπως	7	15	9	2	18	2	1

It is only in Acts that ὅπως is more frequent than ἵνα. The preference of Paul for ἵνα deserves notice.

(3) Use of the optative.

This is a subject which has been much discussed. Jannaris says (§ 1924) that 'as early as the Hellenistic period it began to retreat before the primary subj. until it eventually disappeared altogether'. The best account of the optative in N.T. Greek is given by Blass.[1] He distinguishes between various classes (*a*) the opt. in wishes 'had not gone out of N.T.' (35 exx., all except Philem. 20 in third person); (*b*) the opt. of indirect speech is found occasionally both in Lk. and Acts (Lk. 4 exx., Acts 6). On the other hand rare types survive only in Acts, viz.: (*c*) pres. opt. in place of usual imperative, Acts viii. 20; (*d*) opt. + ἄν in a principal sentence to denote possibility (disappeared from κοινή), Acts xxvi. 29 εὐξαίμην ἄν. So also in direct questions, Acts viii. 31 πῶς γὰρ ἂν δυναίμην, xvii. 18 τί ἂν θέλοι (both literary); (*e*) opt. after εἰ = 'whether', Acts xvii. 27 εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτὸ ἢ εὕροιεν, xxvii. 12 εἴ πως δύναιντο (so *v.* 39); (*f*) hypothetical, Acts xxiv. 19 εἴ τι ἔχοιεν, xx. 16 εἰ δυνατὸν εἴη; (*g*) temporal, Acts xxv. 16 πρὶν ἢ . . . ἔχοι . . . λάβοι τε.

(4) Constructions peculiar to Acts:

Among these are ellipse of ἔφη, εἶπεν (9 exx.), use of καὶ νῦν at the beginning of a sentence (9 exx.). Blass (§ 61. 3) says that the use of the fut. inf. disappeared from popular language and is only found in Acts (5 exx.) and Hebr. (1 ex.). He also notices (*ed. phil.* p. 30) that the use of the fut. participle to express purpose only survives in Acts viii. 27 and Hebr. xiii. 17.

[1] *Grammar of N. T.*, § 66.

(5) Use of negatives. I quote the following figures:

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
μή	94	52	249	27	80	33	49
μηδείς	9	23	33	1	5	8	1
οὐ μή	18	3	6	4	20	10	16
οὐχί	15	2	22	2	10	0	6

μή is characteristic of Paul, frequent in Lk. and Hebr., not so common in Acts: *μηδείς* is characteristic of Acts and Paul: *οὐ μή* is rare in Acts and Paul: *οὐχί* is chiefly found in Paul and Lk.

(6) Choice of synonyms:

(*a*) *ἀγρός* and *χωρίον*.

Moulton and Milligan say of *ἀγρός* 'This old and once common term is unexpectedly rare in papyri: it was replaced by *χωρίον*.' They add that *ἀγρός* occurs only twice in the first ten volumes of Pap. Oxy. Bruder gives:

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
ἀγρός	10	1	0	0	16	8	0
χωρίον	0	6	0	0	1	1	1

This is a very clear case of difference between Lk. and Acts. The one case in Acts, according to Bruder, is iv. 37, where for *ἀγρός* (Γ*Eδ*) *D* has *χωρίον*. If we follow *D* the difference is complete.

It is very odd that the popular word should be characteristic of Acts. Moulton and Milligan conjecture that *ἀγρός* was a favourite word with scribes who were translating from a Semitic original, but this does not seem convincing.

(*b*) Words for 'killing':

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
ἀναιρεῖν	2	19	1 (?)	1	1	0	0
ἀπολλύναι	28	2	12	1	20	10	12
ἀποκτείνειν	13	6	5	0	13	11	13

Here *ἀναιρεῖν* is characteristic of Acts (one of Bruder's two references for *ἀπολλύναι* is doubtful).

(*c*) Words for 'speaking':

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
εἰπεῖν	308	136	15	6	189	103	216
λαλεῖν	30	63	59	16	26	20	59
λέγειν	227	105	100	33	293	307	268
φάναι	6	27	7	1	17	2	2

The rarity of *εἰπεῖν* is a characteristic of Paul: *λαλεῖν* is commonest in Act and Paul: *φάναι* is characteristic of Acts (+Mt.).

(*d*) Words for 'knowing':

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
γινώσκειν	28	18	48	4	20	13	55
εἰδέναι	24	20	103	3	24	22	81
ἐπίστασθαι	0	10	1	1	0	1	0

Here *ἐπίστασθαι* is strongly characteristic of Acts

(7) Words absent from Acts. I confine myself to ordinary words:

	Lk.	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
ἐμός	3	25	0	4	2	39
ἐπάνω	5	1	0	9	1	2
ἐπεί	2	11	9	5	0	2
ἔπειτα	1	9	2	0	1	1
κεῖσθαι	7	5	0	3	0	8
μείζων	7	4	4	9	3	13
μόνος	8	13	1	7	3	10
ὁμοίως	12	4	1	3	2	3
παλαιός	5	6	0	3	3	1
τέλος	4	13	5	6	3	1
χωρίς (prep.)	1	16	13	3	1	2

Some special cases where the omission or rarity of particular words may cast light upon the character of the author are treated in the next section.

§ 8

(8) Plummer says (p. lx) that phrases which indicate the expression of emotion are unusually common in the third Gospel and belong to the picturesqueness of Luke's style. This is hardly borne out by the vocabulary of Acts, e.g.:

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
ἀγαπή	7	0	75	2	1	0	1
ἀγαπᾶν	11	0	31	2	7	5	36
ἐλέειν	4	0	12	0	8	3	0
ἔλεος (τό)	6	0	10	0	0	0	0
ἐπιτιμᾶν	12	0	1	0	7	9	0
κλαίειν	11	2	3	0	2	4	8
μισεῖν	7	0	4	1	6	1	11
φιλεῖν	2	0	2	0	5	1	13

The avoidance of these words in Acts is somewhat singular. There is also a notable absence or rarity of words for eating and drinking, &c.:

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
ἀμπελών	7	0	1	0	10	5	0
δεῖπνον	6	0	3	0	1	2	4
ἐσθίειν	12	1	24	1	11	11	0
καρπός	12	1	11	2	19	5	10
οἶνος	6	0	5	0	4	5	6
πεινᾶν	5	0	5	0	9	2	1
πίνειν	17	3	16	1	14	8	11

That the writer took little interest in rank, beauty, or wealth may be inferred from:

	Lk.	Acts	Paul	Hebr.	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.
δοῦλος	27	3	29	0	30	5	11
ἐλεύθερος	0	0	14	0	1	0	2
καλός	9	0	41	5	21	11	7
πλούσιος	11	0	3	0	3	2	0
πτῶχος	10	0	4	0	5	5	5

The general impression which these silences make is that the author of Acts was rather unemotional and had an ascetic outlook.

Supposed Medical Language in Lk. and Acts

The first person to write an elaborate work upon the use of medical language in Lk. and Acts was W. K. Hobart,[1] who said that 'the phraseology in question permeates the entire works and shows the hand of a medical author continually from the first verse of the Gospel to the last of the Acts' (p. xxxvi). His view was received with some scepticism until it was restated by Zahn and Harnack,[2] who improved the case by dropping three-fourths of Hobart's examples. Harnack's brilliant book 'Luke the Physician' was greeted with general enthusiasm and the case seemed proved.

The situation was changed in 1919 when H. J. Cadbury[3] made a damaging attack on Hobart's thesis. As his article may not be accessible to some readers of this Appendix, I venture to make some extracts from it.

It had previously been said by Plummer: 'Of Dr. Hobart's long list of words more than 80 per cent. are found in LXX, sometimes occurring very frequently. In all such cases it is more reasonable to suppose that Luke's use of the word is due to his knowledge of LXX rather than to his professional training' (p. lxiv). He thought, however, that, if as many as twenty-five genuine cases were available, they would serve to confirm Hobart's main point.

Cadbury shows that Josephus, Plutarch, and Lucian use 90 per cent. of the words in Hobart's list and that of the remaining words few seem to have a medical signification in 'Luke'. He also compares 'Luke' with Mt. and Mk. and points out that they frequently have medical language where 'Luke' has none and describe diseases with more detail and vividness. He further remarks that many medical words passed into common speech. The question, therefore, is whether these are more frequent in 'Luke' than in other writers of similar culture. He calls particular attention to the expression *πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ* in Lk. iv. 38, on which stress had been laid by a succession of writers, who said that *μεγάλῳ* in this sense was a technical term used by doctors and referred to Galen for this statement. What Galen,[4] however, said was that the term was inaccurate though used by doctors, since it substituted quantity for quality (*οὐ κυρίως μὲν ἐπὶ ποιοῦ πράγματος ὄνομα ποσότητος ἐπιφέρουσιν*). Cadbury points out that 'inaccurate uses are quite as likely to be in popular use as to be exclusively professional' (p. 51 *n.*).

[1] *Medical Language of Lk.* (1882).
[2] *Lukas der Arzt* (1906).
[3] *Harv. Th. Studies* vi (1919).
[4] *περὶ διαφορῶν*, ed. Kuhn, i. p. 275; cf. *τῶν κατὰ γένη*, iii. p. 573.

He then transfers the argument from 'Luke' to Lucian, and shows that out of the 400 words in Hobart's index 300 appear in the index to Lucian, while out of the 100 specially selected words given by Zahn and Harnack, nearly half appear in Lucian.

His conclusion is that 'the style of Luke bears no more evidence of medical training and interest than does the language of other writers who were not physicians. . . . Of course, the absence of marked medical traits does not prove that a doctor did not write Lk. and Acts. To judge from the fragments which remain, Ctesias, the physician, uses no more medical language in his historical work than did his contemporary Xenophon, the soldier and historian. So Luke, "the beloved physician" and companion of Paul, may have written the two books which tradition assigns to him, though their Greek be no more medical than that of Lucian, "the travelling rhetorician and show-lecturer", but the so-called medical language of these books cannot be used as a proof that Luke was their author, not even as an argument confirming the tradition of his authorship.'

This judgement is the more remarkable since, as appears from a subsequent article, he attributes both works to a single writer and denotes both of them by 'Luke'.

It would be easy by use of a method similar to that of Hobart and Harnack to prove that any author was a physician. I take for an example Cicero, who, apart from countless metaphors drawn from, e.g., *laborare*, *medicina*, *morbus*, *pestis*, *remedium*, *sanare*, *vulnus*, uses such language as:

Sex. Rosc. 128 qui cum capiti Sex. Roscii mederi debeam, reduviam curem.

Cat. i. 30 ex magnis et diuturnis et iam desperatis rei p. morbis ista repente vis erupit, ut ea confecta et eiecta convalescere aliquando et sanari civitas possit, neque enim est quisquam qui arbitretur illis inclusis in re p. pestibus diutius haec stare potuisse.

Sest. 55 non ea est medicina cum sanae parti corporis scalpellum adhibetur atque integrae, carnificina est ista et crudelitas: ei medentur rei p. qui exsecant pestem aliquam, tamquam strumam civitatis.

Fam. i. 9. 15 vellem non solum salutis meae, quemadmodum medici, sed, ut aliptae, etiam virium et coloris rationem habere voluissent.

Att. iv. 3. 3 sed ego diaeta curare incipio, chirurgiae taedet.

I have not yet seen any answer to Cadbury's paper, and, until this is forthcoming, must hold his conclusions to be good. I notice that Ropes does not refer to the 'medical language of Luke' and presume that he agrees with his colleague.

It appears from this discussion that unity of authorship cannot be proved, as generally stated, by linguistic evidence, which, on the contrary, reveals very great differences between the two works. On the other hand, the prologues to Lk. and Acts most distinctly imply that both were the work of one author. We are therefore in face of a grave problem.

Before making any attempt at a solution, I call attention to a notorious discrepancy between Lk. and Acts, which has been frequently discussed. This is concerned with the accounts of the Ascension given in Lk. xxiv and Acts i.

According to Lk. xxiv, Jesus on the first day of the week appeared to two disciples on the way to Emmaus (seven and a half miles from Jerusalem); at Emmaus he revealed himself to them at supper and then vanished (*v.* 31). They rose up *αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ* and returned to Jerusalem, where they found the eleven gathered together (*v.* 33). Jesus then appeared in the midst of them and took food with them (*vv.* 36–42): subsequently, apparently on the same night, he led them out to Bethany and blessed them (*v.* 50).

In *vv.* 51–2 the traditional reading is:

καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτὸν αὐτοὺς διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν· καὶ αὐτοὶ προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ μετὰ χαρᾶς.

I accept unreservedly, on grounds of sense, the words *καὶ ἀνεφέρετο . . . οὐρανόν* (*om. D*ℵ: 𝔏^{abeff}, 𝔖^{s}) and *προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν* (*om. D*, 𝔏^{abeff}, 𝔖^{s}). If the disciples witnessed the Ascension, they had reason for joy: if Jesus *διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν*, i.e. left them in the dark, they had none.

According to Acts i. 3 ff., Jesus remained on earth for forty days, moving among the disciples and speaking to them. After a final address to them 'he was taken up and a cloud received him out of their sight'. While they gazed up into heaven two men stood by them *ἐν ἐσθῆτι λευκῇ* (in Luke xxiv. 4 two men *ἐν ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ* appear at the sepulchre on the first day of the week).

It is impossible to reconcile the two accounts, especially for those who eject the words *καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν* in Lk. xxiv. 51, thereby banishing all mention of the Ascension from the text.

In order to meet the difficulty some writers suppose that 'Luke' acquired fresh knowledge in the interval between the composition of his Gospel and that of the Acts. Thus Plummer says in his note on Lk. xxiv. 50 (I underline certain words): 'It is not improbable that, when he wrote his Gospel, Luke did not know the exact amount of the interval between the Resurrection and the Ascension. This was a piece of information which he may easily have gained between the publication of the Gospel and the Acts. And while he does not state here or in *v.* 44 that there was any interval at all, still less does he say that there was none: there is no *ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*. Being without knowledge or *not considering the matter of importance*, he says nothing about the interval. But *it is incredible that late at night Jesus led them out to Bethany and ascended in the dark*.'

Plummer therefore suggests that *δέ* in *vv.* 36 and 44 'introduces a new occasion'. If so, this would be a remarkable case of that 'obscurity' which some writers consider to be 'a characteristic of Luke's style'. I can only compare this theory of later information with Zahn's fanciful suggestion that 'Luke', when he saw the daughters of Philip for the first time, miscounted their number, and subsequently, discovering his error, reduced it from five to four (cf. p. 350 on xiii. 1). It would be strange that a writer who, according to Zahn, rectified so trifling an error, left without correction the glaring discrepancy between Lk. xxiv and Acts i.

The only rival interpretation which I know is that of F. H. Chase,[1] who thinks that Acts was written before Lk. (in defiance of τὸν πρῶτον λόγον in Acts . 1). He says that this 'explains the relation between two very notable passages of St. Luke's writings—the closing sections of the Gospel and the opening section of Acts. The history of the Ascension, including the statement as to the Lord's appearance during forty days, which forms the almost necessary introduction to the Acts of the Apostles is naturally summarized and not repeated at the close of the later treatise on the works and words of the Lord Jesus.'

It is to be noted that, though the account in Acts cannot be reconciled with that in Lk., it agrees, curiously enough, with that given by Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 5–7, where a number of appearances, otherwise unrecorded, are mentioned, including one to 500 brethren at once. The forty days of Acts i. 3 would give sufficient time for such appearances. It seems probable that the writer of Acts received his account of the forty days interval from Paul.

The composition of the Acts is a subject upon which much has been written and many bold suggestions have been made. I eschew all such questions as alien to my own inquiry, but on this occasion make an exception to my rule. The circumstances appear to be as follows. The linguistic evidence points one way, and the prologues to Theophilus point another way. If the linguistic proof is decisive, suspicion must fall on the prologue to Acts. Can it be that in the early days of the Church some one who noticed the similarity in style, which undoubtedly exists, between Acts and Lk. as opposed to Mt., Mk., and Jn., added to Acts a prologue similar to that in Lk., in order to help out the identification? I see no other solution. The Pauline story of the prolonged period between the Resurrection and the Ascension remained in its original form after the addition of the prologue to Theophilus.

[1] *Cambridge Theological Essays*, ed. H. B. Swete (1905), p. 381.

ADDENDUM

The new papyrus briefly mentioned in the Preface, p. xii, has been edited by Prof. G. Vitelli with the help of Mgr. G. Mercati, who has contributed an introductory discussion together with a number of notes upon the readings which it contains and their relation to those of other authorities.

The fragment in question, which came from Oxyrhynchus, is a mutilated leaf from a papyrus book, containing on the verso Acts xxiii. 11–17 *εἰς Ῥώμην μαρτυρῆσαι . . . τῷ Παύλῳ προσκαλεσάμενος*, and on the recto 23–29 *ἐφοβήθη γάρ . . . Μωυσέως καί*. Vitelli ascribes it to the end of the third century or to the beginning of the fourth (*non possiamo escludere il principio del secolo seguente*).

It happens by good fortune that the new witness, like the Michigan papyrus, with which Mercati compares it, contains portions of Acts where there are a number of notable *Z* variants. The character of its text is indubitable. Its agreements are constantly with *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^g$ and $\mathfrak{L}^h$, the chief representatives of *Z* in the absence of *D* (which ends at xxii. 29), hardly ever with Γ. It gives unwavering support to the extra matter furnished by *Z*, and in several cases gives us the original Greek of passages hitherto known only in a Latin dress.

I felt some hesitation about reproducing Vitelli's transcript of the papyrus without his permission. This he has most kindly given in a letter to Prof. Hunt, who wrote to him on my behalf. I am therefore enabled to submit to the reader the new text as constituted by him. I also quote freely from the remarks of Mgr. Mercati.

Verso.

εις Ρω]μ̣ην̣ [μαρτυρη-] Acts xxiii. 11
[σ̣]α̣ι̣ γε[νο]μ̣ε̣νης δ[ε η]μερας κ̣α̣ι̣τ̣***[5/6 ll.] 12
βοηθειαν συστρα[φε]ν̣τες τινες των Ι[ουδ]α̣ι̣-
ων αναθεματισ[αν] εαυτους λεγοντες μη
φαγειν μητε πιε[ιν ε]ω̣ς αν αποκτειναστην̣
Παυλον· ησαν δε [πλει]ους μ̄ οι αναθεματισα(ν)- 13
τες εαυτους οιτιν[ες] π̣ρ̣οσελθο̣ντες τοις αρχιε- 14
ρευσι και τοις πρε̣[σβυτ]εροις ειπαν· αναθεμα-
τι ανεθετισ̣αμ[εν] εαυτου[s] μηδενος γευ-
σασθαι το συνολ[ον ε]ως οτο[υ] αποκ[τεινωμεν]
τον Παυλον· νυν [ουν] παρακ[α]λουμ[εν 4/5 ll.] 15

ποιησατε ημιν [**] το συνε[δρ]ιον [το συνε-]
δριον εμφα[νισατε τω χιλιαρ]χω ο[πως καταγα-]
γη αυτον εις η[μας ως μελλοντ]ας δια[γινωσκειν]
[α]κριβεστερ[ον τα περι αυτου ημει]ς δ[ε προ του εγ-]
[γι]σαι υμιν *[c. 18 ll.]*[7/8 ll.]
[***]νεανελε[c. 18 ll.]δ[7/8 ll.] 16
[**]*υ̅ς̅ α[δ]ελ[φης Παυλου την ενεδ]ρα[ν *** (?) πα-
[ρα]γεναμε[νος και εισελθων ει]ς τ[ην παρεμ-]
[βο]λην απη[γγειλεν τω Παυλω προ]σ[καλεσαμε-] 17

Recto.

[νος — — — — — — — — —]
— — — — —
[εφοβη]θη γαρ μηποτε εξαρπασαντες αυτον οι [Ιου-] xxiii. 24
[δαιοι] αποκτεινωσιν και αυτος μεταξυ εγκλημ[α]
εχη ως ειληφως αργυρια γραψας δε αυτοις επι- 25
στολην εν η εγεγραπτο. Κλαυδιος Λυσιας Φηλι- 26
κι τω κρατιστω ηγεμονι χαιρειν: τον ανδρα του- 27
τον υ̇π̇ο̇τ̇ω̇ν̇ι̇ο̇υ̇δ̇α̇ι̇ω̇ν̇ συνλημφθεντα υπο τω(ν)
Ιουδαιων και μελλοντα αναιρεισθαι υπ αυτω(ν)
[επιστας συν τω στ]ρατευματι ερυσαμην κραζον-
[τα 10/12 ll.] ειναι Ρωμαιον βουλομενος τε 28
[γνωναι την αιτ]ιαν ην εκαλουν αυτω κατη-
[γαγον αυτον εις το] συνεδριον· ουδεν πλειον ευ- 29
[ρον — — — —]ω**εωσκαι
]η****
— — — — — —

It is necessary to say a few words about the evidence for *Z* in these verses. Thomas gives five quotations from his MS. He does not quote the reading of *c.Th.* on one important passage (*v.* 24, ἐφοβήθη γάρ κ.τ.λ.), since this was already present, marked with an asterisk, in the Philoxenian text. $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ contains the contents of the verso (*vv.* 11–17), not of the recto (23–9), while $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ is complete. As $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ and $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$ agree closely in *vv.* 11–17, it is probable than many of the readings of $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ in *vv.* 23–9 were shared by $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$. Evidence is also yielded by the mixed MS. 614, which has incorporated several readings from a *Z* source; also by $\mathfrak{S}$ and $\mathfrak{E}$.

(1) I note first important *Z* variants:—

xxiii. 12 τινὲς τῶν Ἰουδαίων *pap.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, *alii*: οἱ Ιουδαῖοι *cett.*

13 οἱ ἀναθεμίσαντες ἑαυτούς *pap.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ (cf. $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$): οἱ ταύτην τὴν συνωμοσίαν ποιησάμενοι *cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$).

14 τὸ σύνολον *pap.*: in totum $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$ (τὸ καθόλου *Bl.*): *om. cett.*

15 παρακαλοῦμεν [ὑμᾶς] ποιήσατε ἡμῖν *pap.*, cf. *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$).

ib. συναγαγόντες τὸ συνέδριον *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{gh}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: τὸ συνέδριον *bis scr. pap.*: *om. cett.*

The corruption in *pap.* is due to confusion between συνέδριον and another word beginning with συν-. For συναγαγόντες (*Bl.*) Mercati suggests συνκαλεσάμενοι, comparing Acts v. 21, where *D* has

και συνκαλεσαμενοι το συνεδριον (στ.)

It seems probable that Γ, *cett.* have here dropped a στίχος.

ib. ἐμφανίσατε τῷ χιλιάρχῳ *pap.*, *c.Th.*, $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$, $\mathfrak{E}$: ὑμεῖς ἐμφαν. τῷ χιλ. σὺν τῷ συνεδρίῳ *cett.*

ἐὰν δέῃ καὶ ἀποθανεῖν *c.Th.* 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$: *om. cett.* ($\mathfrak{L}^{g}$).

Considerations of space show that these words must have been present in *pap.* In l. 17 Vitelli gives [. . .]νεανελε[, but Mercati, with whom Hunt agrees, reads δ for λ. Mercati arranges the lines thus:

ημει]ς δ[ε προ του εγ]
[γι]σαι υμιν α[υτον ετοιμοι εσμεν του α]ν[ελειν αυ]
[το]ν εαν δε[η και αποθανειν ακουσας] δ[ε νεανιας]
[τι]ς ῡς

His suggestion of νεανίας τις, or νεανίσκος (which seems preferable) is founded upon $\mathfrak{L}^{h}$, which has *iuvenis filius* (ὁ υἱός *cett.*). If this is right, I must retract what I have said about this reading on p. 248.

24 In this verse *pap.* confirms the evidence of 614, $\mathfrak{L}^{gp2}$, *vg.*^{aw}, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, which contain a sentence omitted by Γ, *cett.* Hitherto 614 and another minuscule were the sole authorities for the Greek of this passage. Now, however, they are reinforced by *pap.*, which provides some variants: ἐξαρπάσαντες for ἁρπάσαντες (614), ἔγκλημα for ἔγκλησιν (614), and εἰληφὼς ἀργύρια for ἀργύριον εἰληφώς (614). It also gives correctly ἀποκτείνωσιν (ἀποκτενῶσι 614) and ἔχῃ (σχῇ 614, *ex corr.*)

27 Γ, *cett.* here have μαθὼν ὅτι Ῥωμαῖός ἐστιν, while $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has *clamantem et dicentem se esse civem Romanum. Pap.* has κράζοντα .... εἶναι ρωμαῖον and Mercati convincingly fills up the lacuna with καὶ λέγοντα from $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$.

29 Γ, *cett.* here have ἐγκαλούμενον περὶ ζητημάτων τοῦ νόμου αὐτῶν, while $\mathfrak{L}^{g}$ has *nihil amplius accusari quam de lege moysi et de ihesu quodam.* The words Μωυσέως καὶ Ἰησοῦ τινός are supported by *c.Th.* 614. *Pap.* has ουδεν πλειον ευ at the end of l. 31, while

l. 32 is lost except for ω**εωσκαι at the end. Mercati neatly restores the line by reading

[ρον ενκαλουμενον η περι του νομου μ]ω[υσ]εως και

in exact conformity with 𝔏g.

I have not included in this list some cases of minor importance, e.g. *v.* 16 after τὴν ἔνεδραν 𝔏gh, *alii* add αὐτῶν. In *pap.* (l. 18) there is a lacuna of four letters after ἔνεδραν, which Mercati fills with αὐτῶν. Conversely in *v.* 28, where the other authorities add αὐτῶν after συνέδριον, it is omitted by *pap.*, 𝔏g. I also pass over some minute points of agreement between *pap.* and one or other of its allies.

(2) As against this imposing array of *Z* readings, I have only to set two agreements of *pap.* with Γ, *cett.* These are:

v. 25 ἔγραψεν δέ *c. Th.*, 𝔏gs, 𝔖vg : γράψας *pap.* Γ
v. 28 βουλόμενός τε *pap.* Γ *E*, *vg.* : βουλ. δέ δ, 𝔏eg, 𝔖ph

It appears therefore that the affinities of *pap.* are almost entirely with *Z*.

(3) I now turn to original contributions of *pap.* The first point to notice is the ignorance of the scribe. Thus in l. 5 (*v.* 12) he wrote αποκτειναστηγ for ἀποκτείνωσι τόν. In l. 30 (*v.* 28) for δι' ἣν ἐνεκάλουν he wrote ἣν ἐκάλουν. He had a weakness for dittography, as may be seen from l. 12 (*v.* 15) τὸ συνέδριον *bis scr.* (cf. supra), and l. 26 (*v.* 27), where he wrote ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων both before and after συλλημφθέντα, subsequently rectifying the error by striking out the words in the first place. Some of the variants in *pap.* are of small importance, e.g. l. 5 (*v.* 12) ἕως οὗ] ἕως ἄν : l. 10 ἕως οὗ] ἕως ὅτου. The following cases deserve special notice:

l. 3 (*v.* 12) βοήθειαν. The word seems most inappropriate in this context. As there is a lacuna at the end of l. 2, we are quite in the dark as to its construction. Mercati thinks that the writer tried to botch the text after a corruption.

l. 12 (*v.* 15) ποιήσατε. There is no other authority for the imperative construction here.

l. 22 (*v.* 25) after γράψας δέ *pap.* adds αὐτοῖς. This may be a slip for αὐτῷ: it is, however, to be noticed that 𝔖vg adds *et dedit eis.* Mercati therefore acutely suggests that the model of *pap.* had γράψας δὲ ⟨καὶ δοὺς⟩ αὐτοῖς.

l. 23 (*ib.*) ἐν ῇ ἐγέγραπτο *pap.* The nearest approach to this reading is ἐν ῇ ταῦτα *c. Th.*, 𝔖vg. The other variants are περιέχουσαν τάδε 614, *vg.*: ἔχουσαν (περιέχουσαν) τὸν τύπον τοῦτον *cett.*

l. 28 (*v.* 27) ἐξειλάμην] ἐρ[ρ]υσάμην *pap.* This is a striking variant which which may well be original.

I conclude with a remark upon a supplement of Vitelli in l. 30 (*v.* 28). He credits *pap.* with γνῶναι (*E* 383) in preference to ἐπιγνῶναι (*cett.*), the result being that the line consists of 32 letters. According to my computation the average content of a line on the recto of the papyrus is 36 letters (on the verso it is 34). There is therefore room for ἐπιγνῶναι in the lacuna.

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

GENERAL INDEX

GREEK INDEX

(A selection only of words tabulated on pp. 396–405 is included in this list.)

INDEX OF N.T. PASSAGES

(1) *Evv.*

(2) *Acts*

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY JOHN JOHNSON, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY